Sanskrit Academy Series – 58

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Shri Adi Shankara's

Manisha-Panchakam

With Tatparya Dipika of Sri Sadashivendra Yogi

(With English Translation)

Chief-Editor
Prof. Madhusudan Penna
Director

Assistant Editor
Dr. K.V. Suryaprakash
Assistant Professor (Research)

Sanskrit Academy

Adarsha Shodha Sanskrit Sanstha
(Recognised by Central Sanskrit University, New Delhi)
Osmania University, Hyderabad – 500 007
2025

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Sanskrit Academy Series – 58
In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Shri Adi Shankara's

Manisha-Panchakam

With Tatparya Dipika of

Sri Sadashivendra Yogi

(With English Translation)

Chief-Editor:

Prof. Madhusudan Penna, Director

Assistant Editor:

Dr. K.V. Suryaprakash, Assistant Professor (Research)

Sanskrit Academy

Adarsha Sanskrit Shodha Sanstha

(Recognised by Central Sanskrit University, New Delhi)

Osmania University, Hyderabad – 500 007

2025

Sanskrit Academy Series – 58

In Public Domain Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Shri Adi Shankara's

Manisha-Panchakam

(with Tatparya Dipika of Sri Sadashivendra yogi)
(With English Translation)

This publication is published with the financial assistance of Central Sanskrit University, New Delhi

Publisher: Director, Sanskrit Academy

© Sanskrit Academy

Copies can be had from:
Director, Sanskrit Academy
(Adarsha Shodha Sanstha)
Osmania University Campus, Hyderabad – 500 007

Phone - 8331021001
Email: sanskritacademyhyd@gmail.com
Web: https://sanskritacademy.net/

ISBN : **978-93-49398-79-5**

Year : 2025
Pages : 78 pages
Copies : 300
Price : 100/-

Printed at
Karshak Art Printers,
Vidyanagar, Hyderabad (Telangana)

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

CONTENTS

Forward to the first edition	i
Perface to the second edition	v
Tatparyadipika	ix
The Nectar of Advaita	xv
1. Self-effulgence of the Brahman	12
2. Oneness of the individual soul and the Brahman	21
3. Falsity of the world.	26
4. Admixture of knowledge and action	31
5. Non - Anointment of sin to the Brahmajnanin	40
6. Nullification of the initiated deed (prarabdha)	42
7. The body etc. is not the self	45
8. Utility of the thought-wave in self-realization	48
9. Role of intense imagination in self-realization	54

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Foreword to the first edition

Sri Sadashivendra Yogi or Sadashivabrahma Yogi has written a commentary to 'Manisha panchakam' of Adi-Shankara to reveal the tenets. of Advaita Vedanta in a scientific way. Earlier in the XIV Cen. A.D. Sri Madhusudana Saraswati wrote 'Siddhanta Bindu' a commentary on 'Dasa Shloki' of Adi-Shankara. The purpose of both commentators is the same (establishing the Advaita of Adishankara).

Manishapanchakam appears as a simple text consisting of only five verses. The Advaita essence of this text is presented to the readers by Sri Sadasiva brahmendra yogi. It is a creditable act. His sastra training is made perfect with his personal experiences in Advaita yoga which has made the present commentary a highly commendable one. The commentary to the first verse is elaborate. The self-luminary power स्वयंप्रकाशत्व of Brahman is established here in a scholarly way. The commentator has also explained to us why Brahma alone is the truth (satya) and the rest of the world is relatively false (mithya). In the ensuing argument it is established that Jnana and karma cannot co-exist and it is also proved that renunciation of all karmas is possible.

The 'Aham' is itself the Ultimate Brahman, Antahkarana or inner organs Manas, Buddhi, Ahamkara acts as an 'upadhi' or conditioning agent in creating the feeling of 'Jiva' in this pure Brahman. Brahman is 'Nirupadhika (adjunctless)' and when the Brahman gets conditioned by the adjuncts, it is 'Jiva'. The Shuddha chaitanya free from all upadhis is the absolute Brahman. This Brahman is self-effulgent. The upanishadic statement विज्ञातारमरे केन वा विजानीयात् establishes this self-effulgence of Brahman. The material world is existent because its existence is based on the sat or existence of संविद् which is self-effulgent otherwise the world has no independent existence. Therefore, it is stated; ब्रम्हण्यध्यस्तत्वेन असत्यत्वात् । The असत्यव of जगत् is due to its superimposition on the Brahman just as the serpent is superimposed on the rope.

The vedanta paribhasha states, स्वाश्रयाभिमत-यावन्निष्ठात्यन्ताभाव – प्रतियोगित्वम् (mithya is all that is absent in the place or substratum where it is perceived) following the above principle, Jnana being self-effulgent does not depend on any

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

process like karma. It cannot be classified under any class of the four-fold karma, namely. उत्पाद्य, विकार्य, संस्कार्य, प्राप्य karmas. Adi Shankara stated in his commentary on Bhagavad-Gita that Jnana is self-effulgent.

Manisha panchaka bhashya is written in a dignified and rather tough style. The commentator adopts the methodology of Navya-Nyaya in some places to establish Advaita. The technical terms of logic like पक्षता etc, are used in this text. Therefore, one who studied Advaita and Nyaya can alone understand this text. A lay person finds this text difficult to understand. The reader is required to contemplate on Advaita for understanding this text.

ज्ञानाग्निः सर्वकर्माणि भस्मसात् कुरुतेऽर्जुन is a statement of Bhagavad-Gita. Yes, the fire of Jnana reduces all karmas into ashes. Sadashivabrahma yogi states that प्रारब्ध alone is not burnt by the fire of knowledge. A jiva has to serve the term of his प्रारब्ध even after enlightenment. It is like an arrow released. The archer has no hold on the arrow released even by him. It reaches its target. In the same way प्रारब्ध commences with the birth of a jiva. It cannot be averted. Hanuman leapt into the sky to cross the ocean like an arrow released. यथा राघवनिर्मुक्तः शरः श्वसनविक्रमः Sage Valmiki compared him to an arrow released which cannot be averted.

Jnana and karma are explained in different prakaranas. So, Jnana can never be a subordinate of karma.

Thus, the principal tenets of Advaita are explained by Sri Sadashivendra yogi through this Manisha panchaka bhashya. This text is useful for a student of Advaita.

While publishing this text, it was felt that an English translation of this text will be useful to the readers.

Dr. Penna Madhusudan, Head Dept. of Philosophy, Kavikulaguru Kalidasa University, Ramtek, Maharashtra has translated this commentary into English. I therefore wish to introduce Dr. Penna to the readers.

Dr. Madhusudan has studied Sanskrit in a traditional way under well-trained gurus in Sri Venkateshwara Vedanta Vardhini Sanskrit College, Hyderabad. He acquired sound knowledge of Tarka, Vedanta, Vyakarana and Yoga in addition to his training in literature. He took his M.A. Sanskrit degree from Osmania

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

University. Topping in the entire faculty of Arts, Osmania University for that year he won two gold medals and later won a gold medal for his Ph. D degree for his thesis on Yogasiddhanta Chandrika from the Dept. of Sanskrit, Osmania University.

In addition to his regular teaching and research work, he has written a Sanskrit Mahakavya काव्यकण्ठरमणीयम् on Kavya Kantha Ganapati Muni in a thousand verses. Some of his small kavyas are

1. मुद्गलचरितम् (रूपकम्)
2. काव्यकण्ठो विजयते (रूपकम्)
3. नरमेधः (लघुकाव्यम्)
4. आवेदनम् (लघुस्तोत्रम्)
5. तपसा विन्दते महत् (राहुलसांकृत्यायनचरितम्)
6. आर्यरीतिः (मुक्तकानि)
7. कृपाशतकम् (स्तुतिकाव्यम्)

He has also worked as an associate editor for 'Dictionary of philosophical terms', a project jointly sponsored by the Institute of Indology, U.K. and K.J.Somaiya Vidya Vihar, Bombay. He is guiding several scholars for Ph. D. He can speak read and write Sanskrit, Telugu, English, Hindi, and Marathi and has passed a senior Diploma examination in German.

Sanskrit Academy wishes good luck and academic progress for this young and promising scholar.

I thank Dr.V. Srinivasa Sharma, Editor, and Sri. K.V. Suryaprakash, Research Assistant, Sanskrit Academy for co-ordinating this publication work.

Sadashiva brahmendra yogi is the brightest star in Karnatak musical tradition of Sanskrit musical composers. He is a yogi and avadhuta par excellence and is ranked along with Adi Sankaracharya.

I hope that this work will be received well by scholars.

Prof. K. Kamala
Director

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Preface to the second edition

It gives me great pleasure while presenting this second edition of Tatparya Dipika a small yet wonderful treatise on the Advaita in the hands of interested readers. Tatparya Dipika is a gloss on the five verses of Shri Adi Shankara known as Manisha Panchakam. These five verses reflect the essence of Advaita outlook and present the profound spiritual experience of Adi Shankara.

Adi Shankara propounded the Advaita thought as the essence of the Upanishads, Bhagavad Gita and the Brahma Sutra collectively known as the Prasthana Trayi in the Vedanta tradition. His thought is called as Kevala Advaita to distinguish it from the other Advaita thoughts such as Shuddha Advaita of Vallabha or Vishishta Advaita of Ramanuja.

Tatparya Dipika written by Shri Sadashivendra Yogin of the eighteenth century is a useful text on the Advaita system of Adi Shankara. Sadashivendra Yogin was a Yogi and Advaitin par excellence who lived the philosophy he believed in and was revered as an Avadhuta during his life time. Many stories have been on record throughout these many years about his spiritual greatness. Details about Tatparya Dipika are given in the introduction to this book.

Paramahamsa Sadashivendra Saraswati (1630-1756 A.D.)

Sadashivendra Yogi or Saraswati was a great saint, a composer of Carnatic music and an Advaita philosopher who lived near Kumbakonam, Tamil Nadu during the 17th or 18th century CE. He composed mainly in Sanskrit. Only a few of his compositions have survived but they are recognised as great compositions of

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Carnatic Music. He was a unique blend of Jnanam & Yoga with a fine blend of Bhakti.

Shri Sadashivendra Yogi was a Velanadu Brahmin of Shrivatsa Sagotra born to Moksha-inti Somasundara Avadhani and Parvati Amma who settled in Madurai in 1650 A.D. In Kumbakonam, Shri Sadashivendra Yogi was born to them in their old age and was named as Shivarama Krishna. He was married at the age of 17 but soon he renounced everything to become a ***Paramahamsa Sannyasi*** of high order. Shivaramakrishna left his home in search of Truth.

He took Sanyasa from a very old Saint near Thiruvisanallur and reached Thiruvenkadu and became the sishya of Sri Parama Shivendra Saraswati (57th Shankaracharya of Moolamnaya Sarvajna Shri Kanchi Kamakoti Peetham) who was staying there. He studied under his guidance for 18 years and attained knowledge comparable only to the Adi Shankara Himself. He wandered about as an Avaduta, wandering around, naked or semi-naked, and often in a trance-like state. He mostly stayed near Trichy.

He studied shastras from Shri Ramabhadra Deekhshita who wrote Patanjali Charitam. His deekha Guru was Shri Paramashivendra. He used to argue with scholars in his younger days. On being admonished by his guru, he became silent and observed silence for the rest of his life. He was honoured by princes whenever he was found, especially by Raja of Pudukottai. He has five samadhis :

- Nerur (Tamil Nadu)
- Manamadurai
- Omkareshwar

- Kashi
- Karachi - There were visitors from India before Partition. It was supposed to be located close to the Indus river. His main samadhi is in Nerur, near Trichy.

He had written about 22 works which include "Brahma Tattva Prakashika, Yoga Sudhakaram, Atma Vidya Vilasam, Shiva yoga Dipika, Tatparya Dipika etc." and some popular kirtans like "sarvam brahmamayam and piba re ramarasam".

Prof. K. Kamala, the then Director of Sanskrit Academy, Hyderabad published this Tatparya Dipika for the first time with English translation from Sanskrit Academy. The copies soon got out of stock and since then the interested readers have been requesting the Academy to reprint the book.

This second edition can be in fact called a second print with some corrections and additions in the notes. The book is being prepared in a new design and is now presented to the interested readers.

The Academy hopes that this edition too would receive similar response from the readers.

Prof. Penna Madhusudan
Director

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

In Public domain. Digitization: Mudgal Research Academy

या देवी बोधरूपेण मद्बुद्धिमधितस्थुषी ।
सदा मां प्रेरयेद् वाचा तया तामेव संस्तुवे ।।

परमयोगिवर्याणां मूर्तीभूताद्वैतानाम् अत्रभवतां सदाशिवन्द्रयोगिवराणां तात्पर्यदीपिकानामकः अयं भाष्यग्रन्थः भगवत्पादानाम् आचार्यशङ्कराणां मनीषापञ्चकस्य हृदयम् आविष्कुर्वन् लघुस्वरूपोऽपि महतां ग्रन्थवराणां मूर्ध्नि विलसति । अस्य प्रतिपाद्यविषयाणां संग्रहः जिज्ञासूनां सुलभावगत्यै अत्र समर्प्यते। सारग्राहिणः निर्मत्सराः भूत्वा सारस्य अस्य प्रयोजनं विदित्वा आनन्दभाजः भवन्तु इति अभ्यर्थये ।

“द्विधेतं द्वीतमित्याहुस्तद्भावो द्वैतमुच्यते” इति वार्तिकोक्तम् अनुसृत्य नामरूपसहितं द्वैतं भवति । न विद्यते द्वैतं द्विधाभावः यत्र तत् अद्वैतम् इति अद्वैतत्त्वम् आचार्यैः विवृतम् अस्ति ।

अत्र द्विधाभावः नाम **प्रकारद्वयसत्ता** । ‘सन् घटः' इत्यादेः भ्रमसिद्धस्य सद्रूपाधिष्ठानसंसर्गस्य घटादिरूपारोप्यस्य च सत्ता एव प्रकारद्वयसत्ता । सा यत्र शुद्धे ब्रह्मणि न विद्यते तत् अद्वैतम् इति विज्ञेयम्। एतत् अभिप्रेत्य एव 'एकमेवाद्वितीयम्' इति श्रुतिः प्रतिपादयति । अत्र एकमद्वितीयमिति पदद्वयेन सर्वभेदप्रतिषेधेऽपि एवकारेण धर्मधर्मिभावादिभेदस्य प्रतिषेधं मन्वते आचार्यवर्याः मधुसूदनसरस्वत्यः।

यदि द्वैतं पूर्णरूपेण असत् एव भवेत् तर्हि तस्य निषेधः अनुपपन्नः भवेत्। परन्तु अद्वैतसम्प्रदाये तावत् द्वैतम् अनिर्वचनीयम् इत्यतः तस्य निषेधः अपि उपपन्नः। नामरूपसहितम् एतत् सर्वम् अपि ब्रह्मदृष्ट्या मिथ्या इति तत्र आशयः। अत एव ब्रह्मसाक्षात्कारानन्तरम् एव घटादिप्रपञ्चस्य बाध इति धर्मराज - अध्वरीन्द्रा स्पष्टम् अकार्षुः। एतत् अद्वैततत्त्वं तावत् अङ्गुलिनिर्देशेन 'एतादृशम्' इति प्रतिपादयितुं न शक्यते । अत एव श्रुतयः 'यतो वाचो निवर्तन्ते अप्राप्य मनसा सह' इत्यादिवाक्यैः तस्य तत्त्वस्य वागविषयत्वं प्रतिपादयन्ति । तर्हि वेदान्तानां कथं तत्र प्रामाण्यम् इति प्रश्नः उत्पद्येत, तस्य उत्तरम् इदं यत् 'वेदान्ताः ब्रह्माकारवृत्तिरूपां प्रमां जनयन्ति तेन च अविद्यानिवृत्तौ ब्रह्ममात्रं प्रकाशते' इति । एतादृशस्य अद्वैतस्य तत्त्वं व्याचक्षाणैः आचार्यैः सदाशिवेन्द्रयोगिभिः विवृतानां प्रधानविषयाणां सारः अत्र प्रस्तूयते ।

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

अभिन्नं ब्रह्म -

अनेकेषु कुम्भादिपदार्थेषु सत्सु तेषां सत्तातो ब्रह्म भिन्नं न भवति । मायया कल्पितकुम्भादिव्यक्तिषु सत्ता भिन्ना दृश्यते परन्तु व्यक्तिभेदेऽपि तद्गता सत्ता तु एका एव । वीचीतरङ्गादिषु चन्द्रः भिन्नः इव दृश्यते परन्तु तत्त्वतः चन्द्रः एकः एव । अन्तःकरणवृत्तिकारणेन ब्रह्मणः चिदंशः वा आनन्दांशः वा भिन्नः इव दृश्यते परं सः केवलं भ्रमः । सत्-चित्-आनन्दात्मकं ब्रह्म एकम् एव । तत् कूटस्थनित्यम् अखण्ड-सच्चिदानंद-एकरसम् । यथा गङ्गाजले प्रतिबिम्बितः सूर्यः कलुषजले च प्रतिबिम्बितः सूर्यः एकः एव तथा विभिन्नशरीरेषु एकम् एव परब्रह्म ज्ञेयम् ।

ब्रह्म स्वयंप्रकाशम् -

जाग्रत्-स्वप्न-सुषुप्तिरूपाः तिस्रः अवस्थाः सन्ति जीवस्य । ताः तिस्रः अपि अवभासयति परब्रह्म । परब्रह्म एव परमात्मा । अयं च आविर्भाव - तिरोभावरहितः स्वप्रकाश-चिदेकरसः कूटस्थः नित्यः च । आत्मरूपेण सर्वेषाम् अनुभवविषयः अयं परब्रह्म इति आचार्यशङ्कराः सूत्रभाष्ये 'आत्मा च ब्रह्म' इति प्रत्यपीपदन् । अयम् आत्मा स्वप्रकाशः इति अद्वैतसिद्धान्तः ।

परन्तु प्राभाकरमीमांसकाः 'आत्मा स्वयम् एव प्रकाशते' इति न अङ्गीकुर्वन्ति । तेषां मते संविद् एव स्वयंप्रकाशा । तस्याः आश्रयरूपेण आत्मा प्रकाशते इति तेषाम् आशयः। एतस्य मतस्य खण्डनावसरे आचार्याः श्रीसदाशिवेन्द्रयोगिनः आदौ श्रुतिवाक्यं प्रमाणत्वेन दर्शयित्वा पश्चात् तुदनुसारिणं तर्कं पुरस्कृर्वन्ति। 'अत्रायं पुरुषः स्वयंज्योतिः' इति श्रुतिवाक्येन आत्मनः स्वयंप्रकाशत्वं ज्ञायते एव । तथापि तर्कः आश्रयणीयः चेत् एवं पूर्वपक्षी प्रष्टव्यः यत् 'आत्मा यस्याः आश्रयः इति उच्यते सा संवित् जडा वा अजडा?' इति । सा संवित् जडा चेत् जगतः ज्ञानं न भवेत् आन्ध्यं च प्रसक्तं भवेत् । अजडा चेत् अध्यात्मसंबन्धिन्यां तस्यां कथम् आत्मनः जडस्य प्रकाशः सिद्ध्येत् ? संवित्प्रकाशः आत्मप्रकाश' इति शब्दमात्रम् एव भवेत् । विषयाणां प्रकाशस्य च मध्ये महान् भेदः विद्यते यतः विषयाः भिन्न-दीर्घ-स्थूलरूपेण ज्ञायन्ते प्रकाशः तु एतद्धर्मरहितरूपेण । अयं प्रकाशः एव स्वप्रकाशः कूटस्थः एकः नित्यः निरंशः परमात्मा इति आचार्याः प्रथमश्लोकस्य तात्पर्यं विवृण्वते ।

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

अयम् आत्मा जगतः अवभासकरूपेण उपलभ्यते । यदि एषः आत्मा साक्षी न स्यात् तर्हि केन प्रकाशेन जगतः भानं भवेत् ? जगत् जडं खलु अतः तस्य स्वयं भानं न संभवति । साक्षिरूपेण आत्मनः अभावे अपि ज्ञानाधारेण आत्मना अजडेन जडं जगत् ज्ञायते इत्युच्यते चेत् तत् समीचीनं न भवति । यतः जगत् जडम्, आत्मा अजडः इति भानं कुतः भवेत् । तस्य भानस्य कारणम् एव साक्षी आत्मा । एतत् भानं जायते इत्यपि न वक्तव्यम् । यतः 'विज्ञानं भानस्य जनकम्' इति उक्तं चेत् तत्र प्रष्टव्यं यत् विज्ञानस्य परिणामः वा आरम्भः वा भानम् ? भानं विज्ञानस्य परिणामः भवितुं न अर्हति यतः ज्ञानं सदा अपरिणामि । भानं विज्ञानस्य आरम्भः ज्ञानं तु गुणरूपेण अङ्गीकृतम् । आरम्भवादे असत् एव कार्यम् उत्पद्यते इति स्वीक्रियते तर्हि विज्ञानेन असत् एव भानम् उत्पाद्यते इति आपतेत् ।

ज्ञानम् अपि स्वयम् अजन्यम् । 'इन्द्रियार्थसन्निकर्षद्वारा ज्ञानं जायते' इति न वक्तव्यं यतः स्फटिकस्य समीपे वर्तमानस्य जपाकुसुमस्य रक्तवर्णः स्फटिके यथा प्रतिफलति तथा चित्तवृत्तिः चैतन्ये अवभासते । ज्ञानं जायते इति तु भ्रमः एव । एतत् ज्ञानम् एव विज्ञानं, भानं, साक्षी आत्मा संविद् इति ज्ञातव्यम् ।

आत्मा च ब्रह्म -

अत्र कोऽपि एवं पृच्छेत् – 'बह्म जगत्कारणम् इति श्रुतिषु बोध्यते । आत्मा च जगति अन्तर्भूतः अतः कथं द्वयोः अनयोः अभेदः?' इति । अद्वैतशास्त्रानुसारं तस्य उत्तरं प्रयच्छन्ति आचार्याः- 'द्रष्टा आत्मा अविद्यासहितः भूत्वा स्वप्नप्रपञ्चम् इव सर्वं दृश्यजगत् कल्पयति । अतः सेश्वरस्य जगतः कारणं प्रत्यगात्मा भवितुमर्हति । तेन प्रत्यगात्मा एव परब्रह्म इति सिद्धं भवित । 'तत्त्वमसि' इत्यादिवाक्यैः श्रुतयः जीवस्य ब्रह्मस्वरूपं प्रतिपादयन्ति। तत् विरुद्धांशपरित्यागेन अवगन्तव्यम्' इति । यदि अयम् आत्मा परब्रह्मणः अन्यः स्यात् तर्हि साधनशतेन अपि अस्य ब्रह्मभावः असंभवः एव ।

जीवत्वम् आत्मनः न स्वभावः। स्वभावः भवति चेत् सर्वदा तेन सह भवेत् तेन कदापि मुक्तिः न भवेत् । एतस्य जीवस्य ब्रह्मसाम्यं केचन वदन्ति चेत् तत् असाधु यतः जीवः ब्रह्मणा सह एकांशेन समानः चेत् संसारदशायाम् अपि तादृशं साम्यम् अस्ति एव इति अयत्नेन संसारिणः अपि मुक्ताः भवन्तु । जीवः ब्रह्मणा सह सर्वात्मना समानः इति चेत् भेदस्य अभावेन जीवः ब्रह्म एव भवतु न अपरः।

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

जगत् मिथ्या -

अद्वैतसिद्धान्तेषु प्रसिद्धः अयं सिद्धान्तः आचार्यैः श्रीसदाशिवेन्द्रयोगिभिः एवं प्रत्यपादि - 'सेश्वरं जगत् एतत् त्रिगुणया अविद्यया मया कल्पितम् इति भावना आवश्यकी । कल्पितम् इति कारणेन जगत् मिथ्या भवति' इति । तर्हि तत्र कश्चन पृच्छेत् - 'जगतः ज्ञानं विसंवादि नास्ति । अतः जगत् पारमार्थिकम् एव इति किमर्थः नाङ्गीक्रियते' इति । आचार्याः कथयन्ति–'दृश्यरूपं जगत् एतत् अद्वितीये दृग्रूपे ब्रह्मणि आरोपितम् अतः मिथ्या भवति। दृग्रूपेण ब्रह्मणा एव दृश्यं जगत् अवभास्यते खलु अतः एव जगत् मिथ्या' इति। अद्वैतस्य ब्रह्मणः अध्यासः न संभवति, द्वैतस्य तु अद्वैते अध्यासः भवति । अतः अद्वैतं सत्यं द्वैतं तु मिथ्या इति वेदान्तासारः आचार्यैः दर्शितः ।

आचार्यवचनैः जगतः नश्वरत्वं निश्चित्य स्वप्रकाशचिदेकरसं सच्चिदानन्दैकरसं ब्रह्म एव अहम् इति नैरन्तर्येण दीर्घकालं यावत् सत्कर्मयुक्तः भावयेत् स च विधिवत् सर्वकर्माणि संन्यस्येत् ।

ज्ञानकर्मसमुच्चयस्य अशक्यता –

ज्ञानं कर्म च परस्परं विरुद्धम् । अज्ञाने विलसति सति कर्म बलवद् भवति। ज्ञाने जाते कर्म विलापितं भवति । ज्ञानं कर्मणः शेषरूपेण न स्वीक्रियते यतः ज्ञानस्य मोक्षरूपफलं प्रतिपादित् अस्ति । ज्ञानस्य कर्मणः च प्रकरणभेदात् अपि उभयोः सहावस्थानं न संभवति । आत्मनि कर्तृत्वं भोक्तृत्वम् इत्यादिकम् आरोप्य जीवः कर्माणि करोति । आत्मानं ब्रह्म विज्ञाय नाहं कर्ता भोक्ता च इति सः कर्माणि संन्यस्यति। अतः कर्माणि ब्रह्मज्ञानेन सहावस्थानं न प्राप्नुवन्ति परन्तु ब्रह्मसाक्षात्कारस्य उपकारीणि भवन्ति इति 'ज्ञानात् एवं मोक्ष' आचार्यशङ्करसंमतः पक्षः।

तत्त्वज्ञानसाधनं, वासनाक्षयः चित्तनाशः च –

वासना नाम चित्तगतसंस्कारः येन प्रेरितः जीवः पूर्वापरविचारणं त्यक्त्वा पदार्थान् आदते। चित्तम् अन्तःकरणम् । प्रदीपस्य ज्वालाः यथा भवन्ति तथा चित्तद्रव्यस्य परिणामाः वृत्तिरूपेण भवन्ति । मननात्मकम् अन्तःकरणद्रव्यं मनः इत्युच्यते । योगशास्त्रे चित्तम् एव मनः । तस्य बाह्यजगता सह संबन्धः वृत्तिभिः भवति । ताभिः वृत्तिभिः तत् चित्तं जीवति । अतः वृत्तीनां निरोधेन चित्तनाशः

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

भवति । यदि वृत्तयः न निरुद्धाः तर्हि वासनाः उत्पद्यन्ते वासनाः भवन्ति चेत् वृत्तयः भवन्ति अतः चित्तम् अपि भवति । एवं वृत्तिवासनाचक्रम् अनिशम् आवर्तते । अष्टाङ्गयोगसाधनबलेन वासनाक्षये क्लिष्टचित्तवृत्तयः न भवन्ति । तेन क्रमेण अक्लिष्टचित्तवृत्तिप्रवाहे जाते तस्यापि प्रविलापेन अन्ततो ज्ञानं भवति । एवं वासनाक्षयः चित्तनाशः च तत्त्वज्ञानस्य साधनम् ।

ब्रह्मज्ञानिनः पापलेपः न ।

ब्रह्मज्ञानी तावत् 'न अकार्षम्, न करोमि, न करिष्यामि' इति कालत्रये अपि अकर्तृब्रह्मस्वरूपेण आत्मानं निश्चितवान् अतः तस्य पापलेपः न भवत्येव । 'नाभुक्तं क्षीयते कर्म कल्पकोटिशतैरपि' इति यदुक्तं शास्त्रे तत्तु अज्ञानिविषयम्। 'तदधिगम उत्तरपूर्वाघयोरश्लेषविनाशौ तद्व्यपदेशात्' इति ब्रह्मसूत्रम् (4-1-13) अपि ब्रह्मज्ञानिनः पापलेपः नास्तीति प्रतिपादयति । पापम् इव पुण्यम् अपि ब्रह्मज्ञानिनं न प्राप्नोति इति च प्रतिपादयति 'इतरस्याप्येवमसंश्लेषः पाते तु' इत्यनेन सूत्रेण (4-1-14)।

प्रारब्धस्य कर्मणः अनाशः –

ज्ञानस्य उदये सञ्चितयोः पुण्यपापयोः इव प्रारब्धयोः अपि नाशः भवति वा इति प्रश्नं समादधद्भिः आचार्यैः उच्यते यत् – 'तस्य तावदेव चिरं यावन्न विमोक्ष्येऽथ संपत्स्ये' इति श्रुतिकथनानुसारं विद्वदनुभवानुसारं च प्रारब्धनाशः न अङ्गीक्रियते । तत्त्वविदः अपि आदेहपातं संसारः अङ्गीकृतः । यथा कोऽपि धानुष्कः तूर्णनिष्ठं बाणं मोक्तुम् आदातुं वा शक्तः भवति, मुक्ते बाणे स्वतंत्रः न भवति तथा ब्रह्मज्ञानिनः अपि आरब्धे कर्मणि स्वातन्त्र्यं नास्ति । 'अनारब्धकार्ये एव तु पूर्वे तदवधेः' इति (4-1-15) ब्रह्मसूत्राधिकरणेन अयम् एव विषयः बोध्यते । तत् प्रारब्धकर्म तु भोगेन एव नश्यति ।

वृत्तिप्रयोजनम् -

अन्तःकरणवृत्तिः ब्रह्म प्रकाशयति न वा इत्येक प्रश्नः । एतद्विषये आचार्याः अद्वैतसिद्धान्तम् एवं संजगृहुः यत् – 'प्रत्यगात्मा अन्तःकरणवृत्तिं प्राप्य तस्याः भासकरूपेण व्यवस्थितः अतः स्वप्रकाश एव भवति । ब्रह्मविषयकम् अज्ञानं यदा अन्तःकरणवृत्त्या नश्यति तदा ब्रह्म स्वयम् एव प्रकाशते । अतः, आत्मस्वरूपस्य आवरणरूपेण यत् वर्तते तस्य अज्ञानस्य निवर्तनार्थम् एव एषा चित्तवृत्तिः न तु

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy
ब्रह्मप्रकाशार्थम् । अन्यथा ब्रह्म स्वयंप्रकाशं न भवेत् । एतत् सर्वं विचार्य पञ्चदशीकारैः कथितम् –

ब्रह्मण्यज्ञाननाशाय वृत्तिव्याप्तिरपेक्षिता ।
स्वयंस्फुरणरूपत्वान्नाभास उपयुज्यते ।। (तृप्तिदीप – 92)

वृत्तिशून्यस्य मनसः ब्रह्माकारतया यदा स्थितिः भवति तदा तस्य योगिनः असंप्रज्ञातसमाधिः भवति । एवं ब्रह्मावस्थानं संपद्यते न तु ब्रह्मज्ञानमात्रम्। यः एवं परमं ब्रह्म वेत्ति सः ब्रह्मैव भवति इति श्रुतिः अपि एतदेव समर्थयति । ध्यानं ब्रह्मसाक्षात्कारहेतुः कथं भवति इति आचार्यैः विद्यारण्यस्वामिभिः प्रतिपादितम् इत्थम् -

ध्यानेनैकाग्र्यमापन्ने चित्ते विद्या स्थिरी भवेत् ।
विद्यायां सच्चिदानन्दा अखण्डैकरसात्मताम् ।।
प्राप्य भान्ति न भेदेन भेदकोपाधिवर्जनात् ।।
शान्ताः घोराः शिलाद्याश्च भेदकोपाधयो मताः ।।
योगाद् विवेकतो वैषामुपाधीनामपाकृतिः ।।
निरुपाधिब्रह्मतत्त्वे भासमाने स्वयंप्रभे ।
अद्वैते त्रिपुटी नास्ति भूमानन्दोऽत उच्यते ।। इति।।

श्रीमतां सदाशिवेन्द्रयोगिवर्याणां तात्पर्यदीपिकानामकं मनीषापञ्चकभाष्यं आचार्यशङ्कराणाम् अद्वैततात्पर्यं प्रकाशयत् सुद्ध्युपास्यं भवति । पञ्चदरीकारादीनाम् अद्वैताचार्याणां प्रभावः भाष्ये द्रष्टुं शक्यः । पौनः पुन्येन मननादिकं कृत्वा अधिकारिणः अद्वैतानुभवम् आप्नुवन्तु इति धिया एव तात्पर्यदीपिकाभाष्यग्रन्थस्य प्रकाशने व्यापृता संस्कृतपरिषद् नूनम् अभिनन्दनार्हा इति सविनयं प्रकटय्य विरम्यते।

मधुसूदनःपेन्ना

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

The Advaita is a feeble theory constructed on some frail logic, going against popular experience so say some, never trying to get the experience of the Advaita in their life time. Pity on them. Some go to the extent of saying that the Advaita preaches the Jnanamarga, which is difficult to follow, as the intellect cannot get on to the formless self. These ideas are not new. AdiSankara himself faced them and had given them a direct blow in his commentaries. When somebody said:

निराकारत्वात् आत्मवस्तु नोपैति बुद्धिरतो दुःसाध्या सम्यग्ज्ञाननिष्ठा ।

The Acarya understood their problem and said:

सत्यम्। एवं गुरुसंप्रदायरहितानाम् अश्रुतवेदान्तानाम् अत्यन्तबहिर्विषया-सक्तबुद्धीनां सम्यक्प्रमाणेषु अकृतश्रमाणाम् ।

तद्विपरीतानां तु लौकिक ग्राह्यग्राहक-द्वैतवस्तुनि सद्बुद्धिर्नितरां दुःसंपादद्या आत्मचैतन्यव्यतिरेकेण वस्त्वन्तरस्यानुपलब्धेः

(भगवद्गीताशाङ्करभाष्यम् 18-50)

True, those who do not have the fortune of rich tradition of receiving it from the teacher, who have not studied the Upanishads and the Brahmasutra properly, who are interested excessively in the external world only and who have not put proper effort in acquiring the valid means of knowledge properly, experience this hurdle. But those who realize one non-dual self everywhere can never perceive the mundane object like the perceiver and the perceived as real, as there is no other thing apart from the self-consciousness. This is the Advaita realization that the revered sage is talking about in his small book of five verses called Manisha pancakam. Fortunate are those who are blessed with the Advaitic Experience.

The Tatparya dipika of Sri Sadashivendra yogi is indeed a great commentary on the Manisha pancakam of Adishankara. Without this commentary, many would not have understood the philosophical essence of Manisha pancakam. Since the Tatparya-dipika is written in a cryptic language it requires not only a translation but also a summary of its contents in simple language. With this idea, an attempt is made in the following pages to present the summary of the contents of the commentary "Tatparya dipika".

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

The major theories of the Advaita philosophy that Sri Sadashivendra yogi intends to propound in his commentary on the Manisha pancaka are as follows:

1. Self-effulgence of the Brahman
2. Oneness of the Brahman
3. Oneness of the Individual self and the Brahman
4. Falsity of the world
5. Non-Admixture of knowledge and action
6. No-Anointment of sin to the Brahmajna (one who realized the Brahman)
7. Nullification of the initiated deed (prarabdha Karma)
8. The non-identity of the body and the self (शरीरदेरनात्मत्वम्)
9. Utility of the thought-wave in self-realization
10. Role of intense imagination in self-realization

1. Self-effulgence of the Brahman

It is stated in the Tatparya dipika that the Brahman never loses its existence. Even when perceived differently due to the difference in the conditions like ripples etc., the object like the moon does not lose its essential nature of being the moon because, being the moon and appearing as the moon are not two different things?

Similarly, the Brahman also does not give up its characteristic of being existent even when perceived as existence following the existence of objects like pot etc., formed by the nescience.
In the same manner, it does not give up the characteristic of being conscious even when perceived as consciousness following the particular consciousness differentiated by different conditions like the functioning of the inner-sense organ. In the same manner, it does not give up its characteristic of being blissful even when perceived as bliss following the blissfulness differentiated by different mental conditions like liking, extreme joy etc.
How is that possible? It is possible because the characteristics like being existent etc. are essentially the manifestation of the BRAHMAN only. Hence it is said by sages that the Brahman does not give up Its characteristic of being existent etc. even when perceived through conditions etc, because the class like existence etc, is identical with the individual.

The prima facie argues that if the multiplicity of existent individuals were accepted, how can then the non-dual Brahman be established as Existence?
The Advaitin answers to this by saying that the multiplicity of Existence is merely due to conditions. Similar is the difference in existence, knowledge and bliss also. If this were not accepted then the knowledge and bliss devoid of existence would finally result in Nihilism because, existence devoid of the form of knowledge would never manifest itself and if they are taken as perceived (as their substrata are perceived) then they would not have (independent) existence.
Moreover, the Observant. consciousness of the form of existence and knowledge is understood as bliss on account of its being the subject of extreme love.
Therefore, since the difference in conditional form in individuals is negated, it is resolved that the Brahman is of the form of Existence, Knowledge and Bliss.
The scriptures also describe the Brahman as Existence, Knowledge and Bliss with the words the Brahman is Reality, Knowledge and Limitlessness (Taittiriya Upanisad 2-1). The Brahman is Cognition and Bliss (Brhadarnyakopanisad 3-9-28).
The Prabhakara Mimamsaka contends saying that the Self does not shine forth independently but shines due to its being the substratum of the consciousness which is self-luminary.
This view is untenable to the Advaitins, as it goes against the scriptures. The scriptures describe the self-luminary nature of the self with the words "here the self is self-luminary". Moreover, when the Mimamsaka states that the self, shines forth due to its being the substratum of the self-luminary consciousness, they should be questioned, 'Is the consciousness, which is accepted as the illuminator of all objects and in which shine the self and the objects, inert or not?'
If it is accepted as inert, it will be similar to the objects that are inert. Since there is no difference between the consciousness and the objects, the entire world would fall in utter blindness (there will be no cognition of the world in the absence of any illuminator). If it be argued that the illumination of the consciousness depends on others and the self is inert only, this also is untenable. In that case the illumination of the object and the self, even in the inert consciousness related to the self, would

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

not be possible because, even when the son is a scholar there is no rule that the father should also be a scholar.

If it is said that the consciousness illumines along with the illumination of the object and the self, we ask whether the illumination of the consciousness and that of the object and the self are different from the consciousness or not?

They cannot be different, because if the consciousness were regarded as different from illumination, the consciousness would become non-luminary like an object like a pot that requires another illuminator to illumine it.

If the illumination of the object and that of the self were regarded as different from the consciousness, then the consciousness would not be the illuminator of the object.

It would rather be a mere indicator. If the illumination of the consciousness and of the object and the self are regarded as non-different from that of the consciousness, it is not tenable because, if an illuminator different from the consciousness is not accepted it would result in accepting the admixture of the consciousness, object and the self.

But the consciousness and the object cannot exist together because the consciousness that illuminates the things of past and future cannot exist together with the object.

In this regard somebody prattles that the objects are of the form of the illumination. It is untenable because the objects and the illumination are entirely different. The objects are experienced as different and variously measured as long and solid. The illumination, however, is experienced as internal, non-solid, non-atomic, neither small nor long also.

Therefore, it is clear that the object is different from the illumination and is indescribable. The difference of the illumination from all the objects other than itself cannot be experienced if the illumination is not known. The difference of the indescribable object cannot differentiate the describable illumination.

Therefore, it is faultless to accept this illumination alone as self-luminary, without the second, existent in the multitude, eternal, indivisible and the inner-self. So, it is now construed with the next part of the verse that I am the supreme-self who permeates all the three states as their illuminator, who is devoid of the

characteristics like projection and withdrawal and who is essentially of the form of self-luminary consciousness.
The Bhatta Mimamsaka says in this regard that the illumination may be accepted to exist but in cognizing things it must be taken as created by the consciousness that is immanent and functions like eye etc.
This view is not tenable because if illumination in the form of cognition of things is regarded as created then on account of its being created it will become inert like other created things such as pot etc, created from clay etc. In that case, like the inert objects, illumination cannot be self-luminant due to its inert nature. Now regarding the view that consciousness is the cause of the illumination, it must be asked whether the consciousness transforms as illumination or produces it.
The first option is not possible because cognition is immutable. Whatsoever is mutable like milk, changes into another thing like curd etc. An immutable thing like cognition cannot have transformation. If such cognition also transforms then it will be an object like milk etc. In such case it cannot be cognition at all.
The second option that cognition produces illumination is also untenable because cognition is not a substance (to produce a thing). Only a substance produces another substance, as in the case of production of cloth from the threads etc. Cognition is not a substance because others have regarded it as a quality. Therefore, existent cognition, which is a non-substance, cannot be stated to produce illumination. Moreover, in this theory of production, the standpoint is that an unreal effect is produced. Thus, the view that cognition produces a previously non-existent real illumination is incorrect.
If it is contended that the cognition can produce an unreal illumination, then, alas, non-existent things like son of a barren lady etc. should also be produced. Thus, since the theory of origination is not plausible, contrary to these two theories viz, theory of transformation or that of production, it should be accepted that cognition does not originate illumination.
Similarly, the cognition is not produced either. If cognition is accepted as producible, then it will become inert due to the same reason.
But, the cognition of form etc. is observed to take place after the contact of senses like eyes etc, with objects like form etc. If

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

cognition were regarded as a non-product, what would be the explanation of this phenomenon?

It is not a fallacy. The understanding of production of cognition is only an illusion. The functioning of the internal sense organ, which has taken the form of the external object, gets reflected even in the consciousness like the redness of a flower in the crystal.

Therefore, the observation of production of cognition is only an illusion. Similarly, the observation that the illumination, in the form of knowledge of objects like pot etc., is producible is also an illusion.

This observation. is due to the produced functioning of the internal sense organ, which can be ascertained by the process of positive and negative concomitance. The production of this functioning is attributed to the cognition itself. Therefore, as it is not a product, the cognition is real indeed. The syllogistic expression of this is as follows: -

The point of controversy (cognition) is real.
because, while being existent, it is a
non-product like the self.

For this reason only, there will be no inconsistency of this in the prior- negation also, because that negation is not regarded as existent. (The prior-negation is beginingless therefore the reason non-product may over apply to it.

But this doubt is removed because prior-negation is a non-existent thing.) Thus, it is proper to accept that this illumination alone is the perceptive pure consciousness.

2. Oneness of the Brahman:

There is not even the slightest possibility of difference in any form in the Brahman, which is absolutely of one essence. Following the difference of higher or lower conditions perceived in the world, there cannot be real difference or assumption of their characteristics in that absolutely one consciousness. A question may be posed here regarding its possibility.

The answer is: As there is no difference in the sun reflected in the water of the Ganga and in the water flowing on the street of the outcaste, there is no difference in the absolute consciousness even when it is manifested in various forms. If it is asked as to how

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

then the difference is perceived in the two instances, our answer is this.

The perception of difference is due to the different conditions. The scriptures also corroborate this with the words Just as one effulgent sun is perceived as different in variously located water, the birth-less, effulgent Self is also perceived differently in different bodies (kshetra).' 'One absolute Self is present in all the beings and is perceived variously as one and as many also, just like the Moon perceived variously in water that is variously located'.

Therefore, the difference in the Supreme Self is unreal as that in the case of the reflections of the sun etc. The Brahman is absolutely one.

3. Oneness of the Individual self and the Brahman:

In all the wakeful, dreaming and the deep-sleep states, shines forth the absolute consciousness, which is devoid of the characteristics of projection or withdrawal and continues as their illuminator. That absolute consciousness is the supreme self, which shines forth independently.

In this regard some say that the Atman being the Individual Self is real and not due to illusion. But it is mere prattling because, if it is natural then that should never quit the self even in the state of emancipation because, never does one's nature depart from one. As such, the pleasure and pain should also continue even with the liberated selves.

One may say that, just as the impurity of the copper goes off in the contact of the acid, similarly the individual 'self- ness' of the self, in the form of experience of the world of glee and gloom, goes off due to the various apparatus like devotion to the lord etc. Then, how is the emancipation not possible in the form of oneness with the Supreme self?

This argument is not worthy. As the natural characteristics of the fire viz. burning and illuminating do not perish, similarly it is impossible indeed to establish that the natural self-ness of the individual self also perishes.

One may argue that the natural characteristics of the fire viz, burning and illuminating are observed to disappear due to the strength of the cooling stone, sacred incantations etc.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Similarly, the natural individual self-ness of the self can be stated to perish due to a variety of apparatus at work.

This is utter ignorance. Because, the natural characteristic of the fire also is only obstructed due to the strength of the cooling stone and sacred incantation etc. and it is not destroyed.

Similarly, the nature of the self as individual self, in the form of experience of glee and gloom, should only be obstructed due to some causative factor and not be destroyed.

Therefore, if the individual self is absolutely different from the Supreme self, then it's becoming the Brahman cannot be proved even by hundreds of apparatuses.

Some desire to state the emancipation not as oneness with the Brahman but as similarity between the individual self and the supreme self.

According to Advaita this view is superficial because, it cannot withstand argument. It is in this way: what kind of similarity of the individual self with the supreme self is intended here? Is it partial or absolute? If it is stated as partial then all the transmigrating selfs get liberated without effort, as they also are similar to the Brahman partially with regard to their being conscious.

Instead, if absolute similarity is intended then it is not possible because, the relation of the standard of comparison and the object of comparison is possible between those two things, which are similar in some characteristics and different in some others.

In the present view, when the individual and the supreme self are similar in all respects, there is nothing that can differentiate them mutually. On this ground, when it is proved flawlessly that there is no difference between the individual and the supreme self, the individual self is verily the supreme self and not similar.

4. Falsity of the world

Some prefer to accept the objective world as absolutely real because it is the subject of such undisputed convention and is different from the silver etc, superimposed on the shell etc. So, how can the non-dualism be established?

The Tatparyadipika answers to this saying that this view is wrong because, as it is superimposed on the Brahman that is the perceiver, the world is unreal just like silver that is superimposed on the shell. So, the non-dualism can be established.

To this the prima facie questions as to how this world is superimposed on the Brahman? The answer of the Advaitin is clear. Though there is the un-questionable convention in the form of the daily experience, the world is unreal as it is superimposed on the Brahman because, it is a perceptible object like the silver on the shell.

But the prima facie tries to refute this by pointing out the logical fallacy in it, saying that the reason is fallacious, because the subject hood of this reason is unfounded (paksadharmata-asiddhi). The argument is as follows: the world is perceivable yet real according to the dualists. So, there is no concomitance between the perceptibility and reality and hence no subject hood. [Note: the word subject hood is used for the Sanskrit word Paksadharmata here. The presence of concomitant reason in the subject is Paksadharmata as in the example-mountain is fiery, because there is smoke; the state that the smoke, which is concomitant with the fire, is on the mountain-is called Paksadharmata. In the above syllogistic expression viz.

The world is superimposed,
Because, it is perceivable,
Like, silver in the place of shell.

The reason 'perceptibility' cannot prove the unreality of the world. Because, though it is perceived, the world is real according to the dualists.

To this the Advaitin answers in this way: It is not correct. Because, it is a universal tenet that the dual objective world is inert by itself and therefore it is illuminated by the perceiver-consciousness that is the self-illuminant Brahman. Thus, the reason inhabits the entire subject. Therefore, the superimposed dual world is unreal.

"How can then even the absolute self be not stated as non-existent?", the prima facie continues to argue.

The Advaitin quietly answers that the self without a second, is the perceiver and not the perceived. Therefore, it cannot be superimposed. If the non-dual also is superimposed like the dual, there should be some substratum for such superimposition because; illusion is not possible without a substratum.

What kind of a substratum is to be postulated here, non-dual alone or even the dual?

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

The first is not possible because there is no non-dual thing other than the superimposed non-dual.

Even the latter is not possible because, the non-dual cannot be superimposed on some merely imagined dual thing. It is a matter of experience that the silver is also superimposed on some real piece of shell only.

Therefore, with regard to the superimposition of the non-dual also some real thing must be stated as the substratum and not some imagined thing.

The opponent is not ready to accept it. He further argues, 'May there be the necessity of some real substratum for superimposition in general experience, but why not accept an imaginary substratum in the superimposition of the non-dual?

To the Advaitin the dual also is a part of the superimposition. As the superimposed is not different from the substratum that is the Brahman, the same thing becomes both the superimposed and the substratum of such superimposition. The same thing becoming both is absolutely illogical. Moreover, if both the dual and the non-dual were taken as superimposed, then on account of the absence of the external world and a thing other than itself, there would arise the problem in the form of an illusion without a substratum.

The prima-facie questions then can voidness be accepted as the substratum of both the dual and the non-dual? The Advaitin answers that the voidness cannot be accepted as the substratum, because, it is formless and indescribable. If it is accepted as the substratum, it cannot possess the characteristic of being the limit of the contradiction.

Therefore, since the non-dual cannot be superimposed and the dual is unreal as it is superimposed on the non-dual Brahman, that is self-luminant and absolutely conscious, there remains the non-dual Brahman, that is reality, cognition, absolute bliss and without any kind of difference. So, there is no fallacy at all.

Having ascertained the words of the preceptor that the world is perishable always i.e., every moment, one should reflect on that as 'I am the eternal Brahman i.e., un-contradicted in all the three divisions of time and devoid of any kind of expansion or modification, that is absolutely self-luminant, conscious and blissful'. This reflection should be uninterrupted.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

5. Combination of knowledge and action

There is a popular view that an combination of Knowledge and Performance of deeds (Jnana and Karman) is possible due to their being principal and secondary. Therefore, renunciation of all deeds is not possible at all. These thinkers try to accept the combination of both knowledge and action.

To the Advaitins it is not acceptable. (See the Brahmasutra Sankara Bhasya 1-1-4, Isavasyopanisad Sankara Bhasya 1 and Bhagavadgita Sankarabhasya 2-11,3-1, 18-16) Because, knowledge and the performance of deeds are mutually contradictory.

The contradiction is like this:

The origin of all adversities is nescience, which conceals the true nature of the absolute Brahman. Only this Avidya being fervent, the Karma, being empowered by that avidya assumes its form. But the non-dual self-realization arising from the Upanishadic sentences manifests itself while obliterating the nescience and its effect. The effect of nescience is total adversity in the form of doer ship, enjoyer hood etc., appearing in the individual self, due to several conditions.

Thus, knowledge and action cannot exist together; therefore, their co-existence in the form of being mutually principal and secondary is not possible.

Moreover, action bestows limited fruit only in the form of heaven, property, issues etc., whereas knowledge grants the complete fruit in the form of absolute bliss. Therefore, it is not proper to say that the knowledge, which gives the unlimited fruit, is secondary to the action, which gives only limited fruit. The prayaja and other rituals become auxiliary to the sacrifices called Darsapurnamasa, as the scriptures have enjoined no separate result for them. It is observed that the fruitless prayaja etc, are ancillary to the fruitful sacrifices like agneya etc, due to expectancy of the fruit, by virtue of the Mimamsa aphorism' in the association of the fruitful deed, the fruitless deed becomes its auxiliary part.'

But knowledge has been stated in the scriptures to have a separate fruit and hence cannot be auxiliary to the action, due to the absence of expectancy of fruit.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

To this the prima facie argues: The injunction of the prayaja is for arthavada of the fruit, enjoined by the scriptures with the words 'varma va etad yajnaya kriyate' etc., by the strength of vakya shesha or remnant of the sentence and of the maxim that arthavada is the injunction of the fruit in the subsidiary acts. Similarly, why not accept subsidiary-ness to the fruit of knowledge as arthavada like the prayaja rituals?

It cannot be, says the Advaitin. Because, considering the injunction of the prayaja rites as arthvada is proper as their subsidiary-ness is ascertained as they are read in the Darsapurnamasa context.

But knowledge is not read as subsidiary in the chapter of any act. Had it been so, the fruit of knowledge would have been imagined for arthavada. So, due to difference in contexts also knowledge cannot be subsidiary to action.

Moreover, one who is deeply interested in the fruits like heaven, progeny etc., is qualified to perform the deeds. On the contrary, one who is totally detached from such fruits is eligible for knowledge. Thus, since knowledge functions with regard to the particular eligible person, it cannot be subsidiary to the action. Even due to the different nature of knowledge, it cannot be subsidiary to the action.

Action is not illuminating as it is an evolute of nescience. Knowledge is illuminating, as it is the self-luminant Brahman. Thus, when there is no possibility at all of co-existence of knowledge and the action, like between darkness and light, a synthesis of both of them as subsidiary and principal is also impossible. Therefore, appropriate is the renunciation of all deeds.

6. Anointment of sin to the Brahmajnanin.

Does the one who realized the Brahman also get sin?

This is a very important question that pesters some people.

The Advaitin's answer is no.

Because, here in fact does not arise the doubt of even an iota of sin in the one who has realized the oneness of the self and the Brahman. Because, 'I did not do anything. I do not do anything. I shall not do anything' this way he has realized himself as the Brahman who cannot be a doer in the three divisions of time. Even the dull-witted do not suspect even a whit of sin to a non-

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy
doer. How? From the scriptural sentences, the non-clinging and destruction of karma and its result are understood.
After the realization that the self is Brahman, there is no clinging of sin to one who realized the Brahman. The scripture states this with the words' just as the water drops do not cling to the lotus leaf, the sin also does not cling to the realized-one.'
The scripture states the annihilation of the sin accumulated in this birth or the previous many births with the words' just as the dry grass and the cotton-bundle get reduced to ashes in the fire, all sins (of the one who realized the Brahman) get burnt.
Therefore, sage Badarayana also supported this view in the section called *tadadhigama* in the Brahmasutra and aphorized:
Immediately after the realization, there is no clinging to the sins of this birth and there is the annihilation of the accumulated sins of previous births. (Brahmasutra IV-1-13)
The pronouncement that the deeds do not wane away without being experienced pertains to a person who has not realized the Brahman. Therefore, there is no adherence of sin to the knower of the Brahman.
On the strength of the realization of the self that is non-doer, the knower is not defiled even by merit as he is not defiled by sin. Merit is similar to sin since merit also causes birth.
Thus, considering the merit as sin the scripture states all the sins regress from this'. More over the scripture states that one who has realized the Brahman, has to transgress the merit and the sin equally, with the words' this self-realized transgresses both of these (merit and sin)'.
Therefore, revered sage Badarayana inveterated that even merit does not defile the self-realized, with the words of the other also (merit), there is no clinging but after death' (Brahmasutra-IV-I-14) in the Itarasamslesa-adhikarana.
Therefore, the word sin in the original should be explained as inclusive of the merit also.

7. Nullification of the initiated deed (prarabdha):

Before realization, the accumulated merit and sin both are two-fold and have begun their fruits. The self is a non-doer of both of them equally. Therefore, like the initiated merit and sin, why not accept the destruction of the uninitiated merit and sin also at the

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

time of the rise of knowledge itself? This is the question some people would like to ask.

By the self-realized, even his body is submitted to the initiated merit and sin. Thus, the final meaning is that the objective world should be accepted even to the self-realized as mere appearance, till the fall of his body.

Now whatever is said above that the initiated deeds also should have destruction like the uninitiated, the answer is 'no'. Because, from the scriptures, experience and logic, the initiated deeds are understood to have no destruction. The scripture says 'he has to wait till liberation'. On the lines of this scriptural sentence, even to the self-realized the objective world is accepted till the fall of his body. And the experience of the self-realized also is in accordance with this. Now the logic is put forth in this way: The archer is self- willed to accept or reject the arrow till it is in the quiver. But he will not be so, once the arrow is shot. It falls off by itself when the speed is lost. The movement of potter's wheel can also be cited as an example.

Similarly, let the realization of the Brahman be independent in destroying the uninitiated deeds, but not in destroying the initiated deeds. The initiated deed has begun to yield its result.

Therefore, there is no destruction of the merit and sin whose result is not initiated. For this reason only, sage Badarayana also propounded the same meaning in the aphorism: 'but, only those former deeds are destroyed by knowledge whose effects have not yet begun. Because, the scripture says that the death is the limit for destruction '(Brahmsutra IV-I-15).

If one asks as to how the initiated merit and sin get attenuated, the answer is, through experience. The self-realized attenuates the merit and sin through experience and attains the non-dual Brahman that is of the form of absolute existence, consciousness and bliss. The scripture states he has to wait till he gets liberated then he is released and becoming the Brahman he attains it. Therefore, sage Badarayana also aphorized-*having exhausted the other two viz. merit and sin through experience, one attains oneness with the Brahman* (Brahmasutra-IV-I-19).

8 The body etc. is not the self:

There is an interesting discussion regarding the possibility of accepting the body, vital breath, senses etc, as the self. Some

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy
people who think that the gross body is the self argue that everybody experiences that I am a human being which corroborates to the theory that the physical body is the consciousness. Because the body etc. are seen as the substrata of the characteristics like humanhood etc. Therefore, the body etc. should be accepted as the self.

The Tatparyadipika answers to this in the following manner:
The body etc., that are meanings of the word this, get ascertained due to their characteristic of being endowed with the semblance of the consciousness. The I-feeling arising in them is therefore mere illusion like the cognition of redness in crystal. Because, the possible definition of illusion is 'misapprehension of an object is illusion'. Moreover, the gross body that is inert on account of its being the modification of food etc, cannot be the subject of I-Consciousness. The inert lump of clay etc, is observed as a non-subject of I- consciousness.
Therefore, since it is not a subject of the I- Consciousness, the gross body is not the self. For the same reason, the senses, vital-breath, mind, intellect etc., are also not the self as they are non-conscious like the gross body.
The opponent argues: In that case, let the senses etc. be non-subject to the I-Consciousness as they are illumined by the consciousness. But the intellect is consciousness itself. Therefore, denying it as the subject of the I-Consciousness is improper.
To the Advaitin it is not correct. The intellect has the characteristics of production and decay. On account of its inert nature like that of the pot etc., it is properly stated as a non-subject of the I-Consciousness.
The opponent argues further: Then accept the ego- principle as the self because, it is the object of the I- Consciousness.
To the advaitin this also is not tenable. The ego-principle is an evolute of the inner-sense organ as the sattwic modification. It is also inert as it is illumined by the consciousness. Like pot etc., it is non-subject of the self therefore it cannot be the self. Further, the ego-principle cannot be the self as, like the physical body, it is subject to change always due to its various modifications in the form of I am comfortable, I am miserable' etc., which is a matter of experience to everyone. Due to this modification only, it is not the self.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Moreover, it is common in the world that the milk etc., changing into curd etc., is transient. Similarly, the ego-principle also modifies into innumerable feelings.
Therefore, who can prevent it from becoming an inert thing like that? For these reasons, it is now established that like the pot etc., the body, senses etc., are for the enjoyment of some other, as they are illumined by the Consciousness.
So, the inner-self that is the observer and absolute consciousness is the subject of the I-Consciousness, not the non-intelligent and inert body, senses etc.

9. Utility of the thought-wave in self-realization:

The Advaita system has elaborately discussed the utility of the thought-wave in self-realization. According to it, the thought-wave is to dispel ignorance, which covers the true nature of the self.

Hence it is said: The thought-wave is desirable to dispel the ignorance of the Brahman. The semblance is useless as the self then is self-effulgent. Then the destruction of the ignorance also remains as the self-effulgent absolute consciousness only. Because, the preceptors say that the destruction of the imposed thing is no other than the substratum itself (of that imposition).

10. Role of intense imagination in self-realization:

In the Advaita system, the contemplation is recommended after knowledge by the scripture itself with the words 'having thoroughly known the self, the wise aspirant should then reflect on it.' The idea is that the absolute bliss as Brahman, which is absolutely self-effulgent and conscious, will arise in the self-realized individual due to incessant continuation of the contemplation, either when all the functions of the speech and mind cease or when the reality is realized.

The same is said as:
The mind that is free from qualms, from ill feelings and from glee and gloom and perfect, shines like the full moon. To the man who has obtained discretion, who has renounced the world and who is cancelling the form of the mind the bliss increases.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Advaita conclusion:

One, who has his mind completely merged into the ocean of absolute supreme bliss, becomes the absolute supreme bliss only. He is indeed the Brahman of that form and not the knower of the Brahman, since there is absolutely no difference between the Brahman and the knower of the Brahman then.

Prof. Madhusudan Penna

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

In Public domain, Digitization MuthuLakshmi Research Academy

श्रीशङ्करभगवत्पादविरचितम्

मनीषापञ्चकम्

श्रीसदाशिवेन्द्रयोगिविवरणसहितम्

श्रीशङ्करभगवत्पादविरचितम्

मनीषापञ्चकम्

श्लोकः -१

जाग्रत्स्वप्नसुषुप्तिषु स्फुटतरा या संविदुज्जृम्भते
या ब्रह्मादिपिपीलिकान्ततनुषु प्रोता जगत्साक्षिणी ।
सैवाहं न च दृश्यवस्त्विति दृढप्रज्ञापि यस्यास्ति चेत्
चण्डालोऽस्तु स तु द्विजोऽस्तु गुरुरित्येषा मनीषा मम ।। 1 ।।

The consciousness which manifests itself conspicuously through all the Wakeful, Dream, and Deep-sleep states, which permeates all bodies from the Brahman to the tiny creature like an ant and which is an Observer of (all the activities of) the world, I am verily that consciousness and not the external objects.
If one has this firm realization, may he be an out-caste or a twice-born, he is my preceptor. This is my firm conviction. (1)

श्रीसदाशिवेन्द्रयोगिविरचितं

तात्पर्यदीपिका-नामकं विवरणम्

स्वप्रकाशचिदानन्दसदेकरसरूपिणे ।
नित्यशुद्धनिराभासकूटस्थायात्मने नमः ।।1।।
आनन्दघनमद्वन्द्वं निर्विकारं निरञ्जनम् ।
भजेऽहं भगवत्पादं भजतामभयप्रदम् ।।2।।
यत्कटाक्षवशादेव मुच्येऽहं भवबन्धनात् ।
तं वन्दे सच्चिदानन्दं श्रीगुरुं करुणानिधिम् ।।3।।

 In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

My salutations to the Self, who is of the essential form of self-luminant consciousness and bliss and who is eternal, pure, condition less and immanent in the matter. (1)
I worship Bhagavat pada who is bliss consolidated, who is without a second, immutable, unstained and who bestows fearlessness on those who submit themselves to him. (2)
I salute to my preceptor, of the form of existence - consciousness-bliss, an ocean of compassion by whose compassionate glance only I get relieved from the bondage in the form of birth and death. (3)

तात्पर्यदीपिका

इह खलु परमकारुणिको भगवान् शिवः अनर्थमकरागारे संसारसागरे निमग्नं लोकमुद्दिधीर्षुः कदाचित् काशीं प्रति गच्छन्तमाचार्यं प्रति चण्डालवेषं धृत्वा जगाम। ततो जगाद भगवानाचार्यः- हे चण्डालाधम इतो दूरं गच्छ गच्छेति । ततश्चण्डालवेषमण्डितः शिवः प्राह-

अन्नमयादन्नमय-
मथवा चैतन्यमेव चैतन्यात् ।
यतिवर दूरीकर्तुं
'वाञ्छसि किं ब्रूहि गच्छ गच्छेति ।।

Tatparya dipika

With a desire to lift up the world, which is merged in the ocean of birth and death filled with crocodiles in the form of calamities, the most compassionate Lord Siva, in the disguise of an outcaste, appeared before the revered Acharya once, when he was on his way to Kasi. Revered Acharya said, "Get lost you wretched out-caste!"
Then Lord Siva, adorned by the form of the out-caste queried "O best of Mendicants! By uttering the words" get lost "whom do you desire to keep away, the material body from the material body or the consciousness (samvit) from the consciousness (samvit)?"

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

तात्पर्यदीपिका

हे यतिवर! अत्र ब्रूहि किमन्नमयाच्छरीरादन्नमयं शरीरं गच्छ गच्छेति दूरीकर्तुं वाञ्छसि ? अथवा चैतन्यादेव चैतन्यं गच्छगच्छेतिदूरीकर्तुवाञ्छसि ? न तावदाद्यः; उभयोः शरीरयोरन्नकार्यत्वेनैकत्वात् श्रूयते हि शरीरस्यान्नकार्यत्वम् स वा एष पुंरुषोऽन्नरसमय (तैत्तिरीय,2 - 1) इति । एवं सर्वस्यापि जगतो मायाकार्यत्वेनैकत्वं द्रष्टव्यम् । न द्वितीयः; चैतन्यस्य सर्वत्रैकरूपत्वात् । **एको देवः सर्वभूतेषु गूढः सर्वव्यापी सर्वभूतान्तरात्मा (श्वेताश्वतर**, 6 - 11) इति श्रुतेः । न ह्येकस्य सर्वगतस्य चैतन्यस्य देशाद्देशान्तरं प्रसरणं सम्भवति । एतत्सर्वमभिप्रेत्योक्तम्-

परस्वभावकर्माणि न प्रशंसेन्न गर्हयेत ।
विश्वमेकात्मकं पश्यन् प्रकृत्या पुरुषेण च ।। इति ।

तस्मात् सर्वस्य मायामयत्वेन चैतन्यत्वेन वा एकात्मकत्वात् परनिन्दादिकं न युक्तमिति भावः ।

चैतन्यैकत्वमेव स्फुटीकुर्वन्नाह-

प्रत्यग्वस्तुनि निस्तरङ्गसहजानन्दावबोधाम्बुधौ
विप्रोऽयं श्वपचोऽयमित्यपि महान् कोऽयं विभेदग्रहः ।
किं गङ्गाम्बुनि बिम्बितेऽम्बरमणौ चण्डालवीथीपयः
पूरे वान्तरमस्ति काञ्चनघटीमृत्कुम्भयोर्वाम्बरे ।।

Tatparya dipika

Best of Mendicants! Tell me in this regard. Whom do you desire to keep away, the material body from the material body or the consciousness form the consciousness (samvit)?
The first is not possible because both the bodies are basically one as they are products of matter. The scripture also states the body as the product of matter with the word "This Self is made up of matter". In this way, the entire world should be understood as one, on account of its being the product of matter.
The second is also not tenable as the consciousness (samvit) is one and the same everywhere. The scripture states that the luminant self without a second, is immanent in all the beings, which is all-pervading and the inner self of all beings. Movement from one place to another place is not possible in the all-pervading Consciousness which is without a second.

 In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Considering all this, it is said-
One should neither appreciate nor condemn other's nature or deeds, realizing the world being one from the view of both matter and the self.
Thus, the idea is that repudiating others etc. is unjust as everyone is ultimately one, either as the product of the Maya (the inexplicable energy- nescience) or as the consciousness (samvit).
Elucidating the oneness of this consciousness (samvit) alone, it is said-
In the one inwardly existent being, a ripple-less ocean of innate bliss and knowledge, whence is this emphatic insistence of difference even in words like 'he is a Brahmin' and 'he is an outcaste'? Is there any difference in the sun that is reflected in the Ganges, and in the turbid water flowing in the streets of the out-caste or in the space as enclosed in an earthen jar and a golden jar?

तात्पर्यदीपिका

प्रत्यग्वस्तुनि प्रातिलोम्येनानृतजडदुःखाहङ्कारादिभ्यो विलक्षणत्वेन प्रतिभासमानं यद् वस्तु सद्रूपं तस्मिन् । ब्रह्मणो वस्तुपदसूचितं सद्रूपत्वं निगद्य चिदानन्दरूपत्वं निराह- **निस्तरङ्गसहजानन्दावबोधाम्बुधाविति** । निस्तरङ्गो निर्विकल्पः । अत एव सहजो ध्रुवो यः परमानन्दावबोधः स एवाम्बुधिरिवाम्बुधिः सर्वत्रैकरसत्वात् तस्मिन् । तदनेन सच्चिदानन्दत्वं ब्रह्मणः स्वरूपलक्षणमुक्तं भवति ।

Tatparya dipika

(In the above verse) The word 'inward' means the really existent being which shines forth as distinct from the unreal, inert and painful egoism etc., in the reverse order. Having Thus, explained the nature of Brahman as Existent indicated by the word 'real', (now the sage) explains the conscious and blissful nature of the Brahman with the words ‘in the ripple-less ocean of innate bliss and knowledge'. The adjective 'ripple-less' means 'without any distinction'. Therefore, the knowledge of absolute bliss itself is like an ocean on account of its being of the nature of continuous flow everywhere. This states the essential characteristic of Brahman as existent, conscious and blissful.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

ननु तर्हि लक्ष्यस्य ब्रह्मणः सत्ताद्यात्मकत्वं न स्यादिति चेत्- नैतत् सारम् । यथा वीचीतरङ्गाद्युपाधिभेदभिन्नचन्द्रानुगतचन्द्रत्वेन लक्षिता चन्द्रव्यक्तिश्चन्द्रत्वं न जहाति चन्द्रत्वस्य चन्द्रव्यक्त्यात्मकत्वात् तथा मायाकल्पितकुम्भादिव्यक्त्यनुगतसत्तया लक्ष्यमाणं ब्रह्मापि सत्त्वंन जहाति । एवमन्तः करणवृत्त्युपाधिभेदभिन्न-चिद्विशेषानुगतचित्त्वेन लक्ष्यमाणं चित्त्वं न जहाति । एवं प्रियप्रमोदाद्यन्तः करणवृत्त्युपाधिभेदभिन्नानन्दानुगतानन्दत्वेनापि लक्ष्यमाणमानन्दत्वं न जहाति । तत् कस्मात् ? सत्यत्वादीनां ब्रह्मव्यक्त्यात्मकत्वात् । तदुक्तमाचार्यैः-

सत्तादीनां हि जातीनां व्यक्तितादात्म्यदर्शनात् ।
लक्ष्यव्यक्तिरपि ब्रह्म सत्तादि न जहाति नः ।।

Tatparya dipika

(Objection) In that case, Brahman, the thing to be defined, cannot be of the form of existence etc.?

(Reply) It is not true. Even when perceived differently due to the difference in the conditions like ripples etc., the object like the moon does not lose its essential nature of being the moon. Because, being the moon and appearing as the moon are not different. Similarly, the Brahman also does not give up its characteristic of being existent even when perceived as existence following the existence of objects like pot etc., formed by the nescience.

In the same manner, it does not give up the characteristic of being conscious even when perceived as consciousness (samvit) following the particular consciousness (samvit) differentiated by different conditions like the functioning of the inner-sense organ. In the same manner, it does not give up its characteristic of being blissful even when perceived as bliss following the blissfulness differentiated by different mental conditions like liking, extreme joy etc.

How is that possible? It is possible because the characteristics like existent etc., are essentially the manifestation of the BRAHMAN only.

Hence it is said by sages that the Brahman does not give up it's characteristic of being existent etc, even when perceived through conditions etc. Because the class like existence etc. is identical with the individual.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

ननु सद्व्यक्तिनानात्वे कथं तादात्मकाद्वितीयब्रह्मसिद्धिरितिचेत् नः तस्य सद्भेदस्यौपाधिकत्वात् । एवं सत्यज्ञानानन्दभेदोऽप्यौपाधिक एव । अन्यथा सत्त्वरहितज्ञानानन्दयोः शून्यत्वप्रसङ्गात् बोधात्मकत्वरहितसतश्च भानाभावप्रसङ्गात् दृश्यत्वे सत्त्वायोगाच्च । सद्बोधात्मकसाक्षिणश्च परमप्रेमास्पदत्वेनानन्दस्वाभाव्याव-गमात् । तस्मादौपाधिकव्यक्त्याकारभेद बाधेन सत्यज्ञानानन्दात्मकं ब्रह्मेति निश्चीयते श्रुतिरपि सत्यज्ञानानन्दात्मकत्वं प्रतिपादयति सत्यं ज्ञानमनन्तं ब्रह्म; (तैत्तिरीय, 2-1) विज्ञानमानन्दं ब्रह्मेति (बृहदारण्यक,उप,3-9-28) । अतो निरस्तसमस्तोपाधिके कूटस्थनित्येऽखण्डसच्चिदानन्दैकरसे ब्रह्मणि कथमयं विप्रोऽयं श्वपच इति । तल्लक्षणं स्मर्यते-

द्विजोत्तमायां चण्डालाद्यः पुमान् जायते भुवि ।
श्वपचः स तु विज्ञेयः सर्वशास्त्रविशारदैः ।।इति ।।

Tatparya dipika

(Objection) If the multiplicity of existent individuals be accepted, how can then the non-dual Brahman be established as Existence? (Reply) It is not a problem, because that multiplicity of Existence is merely due to conditions. Similar is the difference in existence, knowledge and bliss also. If this were not accepted then the knowledge and bliss devoid of existence would finally result in Nihilism. Because, existence devoid of the form of knowledge would never manifest itself and if they are taken as perceived (as their substrata are perceived) then they would not have (independent) existence. Moreover, the Observant consciousness of the form of existence and knowledge is understood as bliss on account of its being object of extreme love.

Therefore, since the difference in conditional form in individuals is negated, it is resolved that the Brahman is of the form of Existence, Knowledge and Bliss. The scriptures also state the Brahman as Existence, Knowledge and Bliss with the words the Brahman is Real, Knowledge and Limitless (Taittiriya, Upanishad 2-1) The Brahman is Cognition and Bliss (Brhadaranyaka.Upa.3-9-28).

Thus, when the Brahman is existent as devoid of all kinds of conditions, immanently permanent and of the essential nature of absolute Existence, Knowledge and Bliss, how can there be the

difference in the form of 'this is a Brahman' and 'this is an outcaste'?
The definition of an outcaste is found in the Smrti, as 'experts in all the sciences should know an out-caste as one who is born to a lady of a higher caste by an Out-caste.'

तात्पर्यदीपिका

एवमुत्तमाधमभावेन महानयं विभेदग्रहः कः? न कोऽपीत्यर्थः- **एकमेवाद्वितीयमिति** स्वगतसजातीय विजातीयभेदराहित्यश्रवणात् मृत्योः स मृत्युमाप्नोति य इह नानेव पश्यति; (बृहदारण्यक,4-4-19) यदा ह्येवैष एतस्मिन्नुदरमन्तरं कुरुतेऽथ तस्य भयं भवति (तैत्तिरीय,2-7-1) इत्यादिभेद-दर्शननिन्दा श्रवणाच्च । अतः सर्वत्राखण्डैकरसे ब्रह्मणि न मनागपि भेदावकाशः । न ह्युत्कृष्टनिकृष्टोपाधिभेदेन सर्वत्रैकरसस्य चैतन्यस्य वास्तवभेदस्तद्धर्मत्वं वाऽस्ति । तत् कस्मात् ? यथा गङ्गाम्बुनि भागीरथपयसि प्रतिबिम्बिते चण्डालवीथीपयःपूरे नीचलाटिकोदकप्रवाहे वा प्रतिबिम्बितेऽम्बरमणौ सूर्ये किमन्तरमस्ति ? अन्तरं नास्तीत्यर्थः । कथं तर्ह्युभयत्रभेदप्रतीतिरिति चेदुपाधित इति ब्रूमः । तथा च श्रुतिः-

यथा ह्ययं ज्योतिरात्मा विवस्वान्
अपो भिन्ना बहुधैकोऽनुगच्छन् ।
उपाधिना क्रियते भेदरूपो देवः
क्षेत्रेष्वेवमजोऽयमात्मा ।। इति
एक एव हि भूतात्मा भूते भूते व्यवस्थितः ।
एकधा बहुधा चैव दृश्यते जलचन्द्रवत् ।। इति च ।।

अतः परमात्मनः सूर्यकादिवदपारमार्थिक एव भेदः ।

Tatparya dipika

In this way, what is this insistent cognition of difference such as he is noble and he is ignoble? The idea is that, it is none. Because, it is understood from the scriptures also from the words "one alone without a second" that there is no difference of any kind at all, within (the Brahman) or homogenous or heterogenous. Moreover, the scriptural sentences are found refuting the cognition of difference with the words 'he will get death from death (gets birth after birth) who cognizes the world as if characterized by difference and 'when one finds the slightest difference in Brahman, then he will get fear.'

 In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Therefore, there is not even the slightest possibility of difference in the Brahman, which is absolutely of one essence. Following the difference of higher or lower conditions, there cannot be real difference or assumption of their characteristics in that absolutely one Consciousness (samvit). How is it possible?

As there is no difference in the sun reflected in the water of the Ganga or in the water in the street of the outcaste, there is no difference in the absolute consciousness (samvit) even when it is manifested in various forms.

How is then the perception of difference in both the instances? If it is asked so, our Reply is this-the perception of difference is due to the different conditions.

The scriptures also corroborate this with the words' Just as one effulgent Sun is perceived as different in various types of waters, the birth-less effulgent Self also is perceived differently in different bodies (kshetra).' 'One absolute Self is present in all the beings and is perceived variously as one and as many also, just like the Moon is variously perceived in different waters'.

Therefore, the difference in the Supreme Self is unreal as that in the reflections of the sun etc.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

ननु, न सूर्यतुल्यत्वमिहोपपद्यते । सूर्यस्य हि रूपवतः परिच्छिन्नस्य रूपवति सलिले प्रतिबिम्बभावः संभवति । आत्मनस्तु नीरूपत्वाद परिच्छिन्नत्वाच्च कथमनात्मनि देहादौ प्रतिबिम्बभावः संबोभविष्यतीति चेत्, नायं दोषः युक्त एव त्वयं दृष्टान्तो विवक्षितांशसंभवात् । न हि दृष्टान्तदाष्टन्तिकयोः सर्वांशेन साम्यं पदमजेनापि प्रतिपादयितुं पार्यते सर्वसाम्ये हि दृष्टान्तदान्तिकाभेदप्रसङ्गात् । अस्मिन्नंशे हि साम्यम् एकः सूर्य उपाधिवशान्नानेवोपाधिगतधर्मवानिव लक्ष्यते, एवं परमात्मा परमार्थत एकोऽपि निर्विकारोऽपि देहाद्युपाध्यन्तस्तावन्नानेवोपाधिधर्मान् द्विह्रस्वादीन् भजत इवोपलक्ष्यत इत्येवं दृष्टान्तदाष्टन्तिकभावे किं वा बाधकमस्ति ?

अत एव भगवान् बादरायणः एतदसूत्रयत्- अत एव चोपमा सूर्यकादिवत् (ब्रह्मसूत्रम् 3.2.18) इति । दृष्टान्तान्तरमाह काञ्चनघटीमृत्कुम्भयोर्वाम्बर इति । यथा परमार्थतः परिपूर्ण एकोऽप्याकाशो रुक्मघटमृद्घटयोरवच्छिन्नतया नानेव परिच्छिन्न इवोपलक्ष्यते, न हि तस्मिन् वास्तवभेदः परिच्छिन्नभावो वास्ति । एवं परमत्मा

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

परमार्थतोऽपरिच्छिन्न एकोऽपि देहाद्यवच्छिन्नत्वेन नानेव परिच्छिन्न इवानुभूयमानोऽपि सर्वदा परिपूर्ण एवावशिष्यते । तथा च श्रूयते-

घटसंवृतमाकाशं नीयमाने घटे यथा ।
घटो नीयेत नाकाशं तद्वज्जीवो नभोपमः ।।
आकाशवत् सर्वगतश्च नित्यः इति च ।

तदुक्तम्-

चण्डालदेहे पश्वादिशरीरे ब्रह्मविग्रहे ।
अन्येषु तारतम्येन स्थितेषु पुरुषोत्तमः ।।
व्योमवत् सर्वदा व्याप्तः सर्वसंबन्धवर्जितः ।
एकरूपो महादेवः स्थितः सोऽहं परामृतः ।। इति ।

अतः सर्वत्राखण्डैकरसे स्वप्रकाशचिद्घनसदानन्दसान्द्रे परिपूर्ण एकस्मिन् ब्रह्मणि भेदानवकाशात् परनिन्दा कथं संजाघटीतीति भावः ।

Tatparya dipika

(Objection) In this instance, the comparison with the Sun is not possible. Because, the reflection of the embodied and finite Sun is possible in the corporeal waters but the self is formless and limitless, how can then its reflection be possible in the non-self that is the bodies etc.?

(Reply) It is not a fallacy. Since the point intended to be stated is possible in this, the comparison is apt. Even the birthless Brahman cannot establish the absolute non difference between the illustration and the illustrated. If the illustration and the illustrated were similar by all means, it would lead to their identity.

The similarity is in this point: due to the conditions, one Sun appears to be many and to have the characteristics of the conditions. Similarly, though one and immutable absolutely, the Supreme-self appears to be many and to have the characteristics like growth, decay etc, of the conditions like bodies etc.

Thus, when the relation of illustration and the illustrated is established, where is the fallacy? For this the great sage Badarayana aphorized-'Therefore, the comparison with the Sun etc.' (Brahmasutra III-II-18) Another illustration is given by the words' as ether in a golden vessel or an earthen pot'. The idea is this- though it is absolutely unlimited and one, ether appears to be limited and many, being delimited by the golden vessel or an

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy
earthen pot. Indeed, there is neither real difference nor limitedness in ether. Similarly, though absolutely limitless and one, the supreme-self appears to be limited and many due to the conditions like body etc. Even though he is experienced so, the supreme-self remains as complete always.

The scriptures also state -'When the ether is limited in the pot, it is the pot that is carried and not ether. Similarly, the Self is identical with ether.' Like ether the self is all- pervading and eternal.'

It is said,' In all the different bodies like that of Chandala or animals, which are the embodiment of the Brahman, there is one Supreme Self who is all pervading like the sky always, which is devoid of all relations and of one form only. I am that eternal Supreme Self.'

Therefore, the idea is that when there is no possibility of difference in one eternal Self, who is self-luminant, absolute consciousness (samvit) and absolute bliss how can there be repudiation of others?

तात्पर्यदीपिका

योऽवस्थात्रयभिन्न-
सभासकः सच्चिदेकरसमेकम् ।
बोधयति शिष्यवृन्दं
परशिवेन्द्रं प्रणौमि यतिचन्द्रम् ।।

इत्थमीश्वरवाक्यं निशम्य सर्वज्ञो भगवानाचार्यः सकलसाधनकलापैः सहश्रुताध्यात्मशास्त्रान् विगलितनिरन्तरनिरतिशयनिजानन्दानु संधानतयाऽनुपशान्तस्वान्तान् अत एवाविगलिताभिमानवतः कांश्चित् पुरुषविशेषानुपलक्ष्य तेषां विनैव समाधिना ब्राह्मणत्वाद्यभिमानापनुत्तये स्वपदे विश्रान्तये च पञ्चभिः लोकैः स्वानुभूतिमाविष्करोति तत्रापि जाग्रदाद्यवस्थात्रयावभासकत्वेन परब्रह्माभेदं दर्शयति **जाग्रत्स्वप्नसुषुप्तिष्विति**।

- यदा आदित्याद्यनुगृहीतैश्चक्षुरादीन्द्रियैः शब्दादिस्थूल-विषयाणामुपलब्धिस्तदा **जाग्रदवस्था** ।
- यदा तु चक्षुरादीन्द्रियाणामुपरतत्वेन चित्तस्यापि बाह्यव्यापारोपरमः केवलं वासनामयपदार्थाकारपरिणामेनावस्थानं तदा **स्वप्नावस्था** ।

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

- यदा तु कारणभूते भावरूपाज्ञाने इन्द्रियान्तरवत् चित्तमपि प्रविलीयते तदा सुषुप्त्यवस्था ।

आसु तिसृष्वप्यवस्थासु तदवभासकत्वेनानुवर्तमाना **स्फुटतरा** आविर्भावतिरोभाव धर्मरहितं **या संवित्** =चैतन्यैकरसः परमात्मा, **उज्जृम्भते** = स्वयमेव प्रकाशते ।

Tatparya dipika

My salutations to that great Saint who is the Supreme Lord and who, while illuminating the absolute Reality which is different from all the three conditions of Self, enlightens the disciples about the absolute existent and conscious Self.

Having Thus, heard the words of Lord, the omniscient venerable Preceptor, with the noble intention of dispelling their false ego of being High caste etc. and of facilitating Self- realization without the need of Samadhi experience, expresses his realization through five verses. This is for that kind of people who, in spite of their knowledge of scriptures together with their various practices, are still under the spell of nescience having their minds un-quietened by the constant realization of supreme Self-bliss, and therefore, who are still egoistic.

There also, with the words ′ in wakeful, dream and deep sleep state', he enunciates the non-difference of the absolute Brahman as the illuminator of all the three states.

Definitions:

- Being empowered by the Sun (light) etc, when the senses like eye etc, comprehend the gross objects like sound etc, it is the wakeful-state.
- Due to the non-function of the senses like eye etc, when the mind stops functioning externally and remains as a modification of mere object of imagination, it is the dream-state.
- And when even the mind, like any other sense organ, merges into the causal-positive- nescience, it is the deep-sleep state.

In all these three states shines forth the absolute consciousness (samvit), which is devoid of the characteristics of projection or withdrawal and continues as their illuminator.

That absolute consciousness (samvit) is the supreme-self, which shines forth. independently.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

The self-effulgence of the Brahman
ब्रह्मणः स्वयंप्रकाशत्वम्

तात्पर्यदीपिका

अत्र **प्राभाकराः** नायमात्मा स्वयमेव प्रकाशते, अपि तु स्वप्रकाशसंविदा-श्रयत्वेन प्रकाशत इत्याचक्षते ।
नैतत्सारं श्रुतिविरोधात् । श्रूयते ह्यात्मनः स्वयंज्योतिष्टवम त्रायं पुरुषः स्वयंज्योतिरिति । यदुक्तं स्वप्रकाशसंविदाश्रयत्वेनात्मा प्रथत इति तत्र वक्तव्यं येयमर्थप्रकाशरूपा संविद् यस्यामर्थश्चात्मा च प्रथेते सा किं जडाऽहोस्विदजडा ? जडैव चेदर्थात्मनोऽपि जडतयाऽविशेषादशेषस्य जगतः प्राप्तमान्ध्यम् ।
नन्वभ्युपेयते संविदपराधीनप्रकाशेति, आत्मा तु जड एव स्यादिति चेत् - नैतत् सङ्गतम् । अध्यात्मसंबन्धिन्यां संविद्यजडायामप्यर्थात्मनोः प्रकाशमानता न सिद्ध्येत् पण्डितेऽपि पुत्रे पितुरपाण्डित्यवत् ।

Tatparya dipika

(Objection) The Prabhakara Mimamsaka contend this saying that the Self does not shine forth independently but shines due to its being the substratum of the consciousness (samvit) which is self-luminating.
(Reply) This view is untenable as it goes against the scriptures. The scriptures state the self-luminating nature of the self with the words "here the self is self-luminary". And whatever has been said that the self, shines forth due to its being the substratum of the self-illuminating consciousness (samvit), the Mimamsaka should be questioned in this regard Is the consciousness, which is accepted as the illuminator of all objects and in which shine the self and the objects, inert or not?
If it is accepted as inert, it will be similar to the objects that are inert. Since there is no difference between the consciousness and the objects, the entire world would fall in utter blindness (there will be no cognition of the world in the absence of any illuminator). If it is said that the illumination of the consciousness (samvit) depends on others and the self is inert only, this also is untenable. In that case the illumination of the object and the self, even in the inert consciousness related to the self, would not be

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy
possible. Because, even when the son is a scholar there is no rule that the father should also be a scholar.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

नन्वर्थात्मनोः प्रकाशेन सह संवित् प्रकाशत इति चेत् तत्र वक्तव्यम् यः संविदः प्रकाशो यश्चार्थात्मनोस्तौ किं संविदः सकाशाद् भिन्नावाहोस्विदभिन्नौ ? न तावदाद्यः संविदः प्रकाशव्यतिरेके संविदप्रकाशरूपा सती घटवदन्यप्रकाशा स्यात् ।
अर्थात्मप्रकाशयोः संविदव्यतिरेके संविदर्थप्रकाशा न भवेत् किं तु ज्ञापिका स्यात् ।
ननु संविदोऽर्थात्मनोश्च तु प्रकाशौ संविदः सकाशादभिन्नाविति चेन्न, संविदतिरिक्तप्रकाशानङ्गीकारे संविदर्थात्मनां साहित्यमुक्तं स्यात् । न हि जात्वर्थ-संविदोः सहभावः संभवति, अतीतानागतार्थगोचरायाः संविदोऽर्थसहभावाभावात् ।

Tatparya dipika

If it is said that the consciousness (samvit) illumines along with the illumination of the object and the self, we ask whether the illumination of the consciousness and that of the object and the self are different from the consciousness or not?
They cannot be different, because if the consciousness (samvit) were regarded as different from illumination, the consciousness (samvit) would become non-illuminating and like pot-like object it would require another illuminator to illumine it.
If the illumination of the object and that of the self were regarded as different from the consciousness (samvit), then the consciousness (samvit) would not be the illuminator of the object. It would rather be a mere indicator. If the illumination of the consciousness and that of the object and the self are regarded as not different from that of the consciousness (samvit), it is not tenable.
Because, if an illuminator different from the consciousness (samvit) is not accepted it would result in accepting the admixture of the consciousness, object and the self. But, the consciousness (samvit) and the object cannot exist together because the consciousness (samvit) that illuminates the things of past and future cannot exist together with the object.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

तात्पर्यदीपिका

अत्र कश्चित् प्रलपति *प्रकाशस्य स्वरूपा विषया* इति तदसंगतम्। विषयप्रकाशयोरत्यन्तविलक्षणत्वात् । विषयाः भिन्नदीर्घस्थूलतयाऽनुभूयन्ते। प्रकाशस्त्वान्तरास्थूलानण्वहस्वदीर्घ तयाऽनुभूयते । प्रकाशादन्योऽर्थोऽनिर्वचनीय इति व्यक्तमुत्पश्यामः । न चास्य प्रकाशस्याजानतः स्वलक्षणभेदोऽनुभूयते । न चानिर्वाच्यार्थभेदः प्रकाशं निर्वाच्यं भेत्तुमर्हति ।

तस्मादयं प्रकाश एव स्वप्रकाश एकः कूटस्थ नित्यो निरंशः प्रत्यगात्मेत्यनवद्यम्। अतो योऽयमवस्थात्रयावभासकत्वे-नानुवर्तमानः आविर्भावतिरोभावधर्मरहितः स्वप्रकाशचिदेकरसः परमात्मा स एवाहमस्मीत्युत्तरेणान्वयः ।

Tatparya dipika

In this regard somebody prattles that the objects are of the form of the illumination. (To the Advaitins) it is untenable because the objects and the illumination are entirely different. The objects are experienced as different and variously measured as long and solid. The illumination, however, is experienced as internal, non-solid, non-atomic, neither small nor long also. Therefore, we find it very clearly that the object is different from the illumination and is indescribable.

The difference of the illumination from all the objects other than itself cannot be experienced if the illumination is not known. The difference of the indescribable object cannot differentiate the describable illumination.

Therefore, it is faultless to accept this illumination alone as self-luminary, without a second, existent in the multitude, eternal, indivisible and the inner-self. So, it is now construed with the next part of the verse that I am the supreme-self who permeates all the three states as their illuminator, who is devoid of the characteristics like projection and withdrawal and who is essentially of the form of self-luminary consciousness (samvit).

तात्पर्यदीपिका

एवमवस्थात्रयावभासकत्वेन प्रतीचः परब्रह्मतां प्रदर्श्य व्यष्टिसमष्ट्यात्मक-सकलशरीराद्यधिष्ठानत्वेन तदवभासकतया प्रत्यगात्मनः परब्रह्मतां दर्शयति। या **ब्रह्मादिपिपीलिकान्ततनुषु प्रोता** = आत्मभावेनावभासकतयाऽवस्थिता **या संवित्** यो

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

विज्ञानैकरसः परमात्मा ! न केवलमयमात्मा देहादिचेतनप्रपञ्च स्यावभासकः अपि तु जगतः प्रपञ्चस्यापीत्याह— **जगत्साक्षिणीति** । साक्षादीक्षत इति साक्षी सर्वस्य जगतो द्रष्टा परमात्मा ।

Tatparya dipika

Having Thus, demonstrated that the individual self is the absolute self, due to its being the illuminator of the three states, the author now proceeds to demonstrate that the individual self is the absolute self, due to its being the illuminator of all the individual and collective bodies, with the words- that which permeates all the bodies from the supreme self to an ant etc. This means that it is the supreme consciousness that remains as the illuminator as self and it is of the form of absolute bliss. This self is not the illuminator of the sentient world like the various bodies alone; it is the illuminator of the inert world also. This idea is expressed by the words 'in the witness of the world'. The word sakshin means the direct observer and it is the supreme self who cognizes the entire world.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

नन्वेतादृशात्माऽस्ति चेत् किमिति नोपलभ्यत इति चेन्न, जगदवभासकत्वेनोपलभ्यमानत्वात् । यद्यसौ चिन्मात्ररूपः साक्षी न स्यात् केन तर्हि प्रकाशेन साक्ष्यं जगद्भायात् ?

ननु साक्षिरूपवत् साक्ष्यस्यापि स्वत एव भानं किं न स्यादिति चेन्न, साक्षिस्फुरणाभावे तस्य जडत्वेन स्वाभाविकस्फुरणासंभवात् ।

यद्युच्येत साक्षिणोऽभावेऽपि जडं जगदजडेन ज्ञानाधारेणात्मना तदा ज्ञायत एवेति, हन्त तर्ह्यनात्मा जडः, आत्मा चाजड इत्येतद्भानं तव कथं बोभविष्यति ? तथा च यो भानविषयः स तावज्जडः, यस्तादृगाश्रयः सोऽजड इति जडत्वाजडत्वे उभेऽपि भानाधीननिरूपणे इत्यवश्यमकामेनाऽपि साक्षिस्वरूपं भानमङ्गीकर्तव्यम् ।

Tatparya dipika

(Objection): If there exists such kind of a self, why is it not perceived as such?

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

(Reply): The self is perceived as the illuminator of the world. If this self does not exist, then by which illumination does this perceivable world become perceived?
(Objection): Why is it not possible to accept that the perceivable world shines forth itself like the consciousness. (samvit)?
(Reply): It is not possible because, it is inert and would not shine by itself in the absence of the shining of the perceiver.
If it is contended that even in the absence of such a self the inert world shines forth due to the sentient self that is the substratum of cognition, alas, then how do you get the cognition that the non-self is inert and the self is sentient?
Thus, it must be accepted even by a person who is not willing to do so, that the nature of the perceiver is illumination. Since the assertion, of both inertness and sentience (in the form of the perceived is inert and the substratum of such perception is sentient) depends on the illumination.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

अत्र भाट्टाः:-

अस्तु भानं तच्च चक्षुरादिवन्निलीनेन विज्ञानेन स्वविषये जन्यत इति जगुः ।

तन्न संगतमेव स्यात् । यदि हि विषयस्फुरणरूपं भानं जन्यं स्यात् तर्हि मृज्जन्यघटादिवज्जन्यत्वेन जडमेव स्यात् । अतो विषयवद्भानस्यापि जडत्वाविशेषात् स्वतः स्फूर्तिर्न स्यात् । यत्तावदुक्तं भानस्य विज्ञानं जनकमिति तत्र वक्तव्यम् - किं विज्ञानं भानरूपेण परिणमते ? उत भानस्यारम्भकम् ?

न तावदाद्यः ज्ञानस्याविकियत्वात् । विकारिण एव क्षीरादेर्दध्याकारेण परिणामो दृष्टः न ह्यविक्रियस्य ज्ञानस्य परिणामः संभवति यदि ज्ञानस्यापि विक्रिया स्यात् तर्हि क्षीरादिवच्चेत्यमेव भवेत् । अतो दृश्यत्वे ज्ञानत्वमेव हीयेत ।

नापि द्वितीयः, विज्ञानस्याद्रव्यत्वात् । द्रव्यं हि द्रव्यान्तरारम्भकं तन्तुपटादौ तथा दृष्टत्वात् । नहि ज्ञानं द्रव्यं गुणत्वेन परैरङ्गीकारात् । भानस्याद्रव्येण सता ज्ञानेनारम्भो न युक्तः । अपि चारम्भवादे ह्यसदेव कार्यमुत्पद्यत इति स्थितिः । तथा चासतः सद्रूपभानस्य ज्ञानमारम्भकमिति न युक्तम् । यदि हि ज्ञानमसदपि भानमारभेत हन्त तर्ह्यं सत्त्वाविशेषाद् वन्ध्यापुत्रादेरारम्भकत्वं स्यात् ।

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

तस्मात् परिणामारम्भकत्वव्यतिर-कणोत्पादकत्वानिरूपणाद् विज्ञानेन भानं नोत्पद्यते । एवं विज्ञानमपि न जन्यते, यदि हि विज्ञानं जन्यं स्यात् तर्हि जन्यत्वेन हेतुना जडमेव स्यात् ।

Tatparya dipika

The Bhatta Mimamsaka argue in this regard that the illumination may be accepted to exist but in cognizing things it must be taken as created by the consciousness (samvit) that is immanent and functions like eye etc.

This view is not tenable (to the Advaitins) because if illumination in the form of cognition of things is regarded as created then on account of its being created it will become inert like other created things such as pot etc. created from clay etc. In that case, like the inert objects, illumination cannot be self-illuminating due to its inert nature. Now regarding the view that consciousness (samvit) is the cause of the illumination, it must be asked whether the consciousness (samvit) transforms as illumination or produces it.

- The first option (that the consciousness transforms as illumination) is not possible because cognition is immutable. Whatsoever is mutable like milk that changes into another thing like curd etc. An immutable thing like cognition cannot have transformation. If such cognition also transforms then it will be an object like milk etc. In such case it cannot be cognition at all.
- The second option (that the consciousness produces the illumination) is also untenable because cognition is not a substance (to produce a thing). Only a substance produces another substance, as in the production of threads and cloth etc. Cognition is not a substance because others have regarded it as a quality.

Therefore, existent cognition, which is a non-substance, cannot be stated to produce illumination. Moreover, in this theory of production, the standpoint is that an unreal effect is produced. Thus, the view that cognition produces a previously non-existent real illumination is incorrect. If it is contended that the cognition can produce an unreal illumination, then, alas, non-existent things like son of a barren lady etc. should also be produced.

Thus, since the theory of origination is not plausible, on the contrary of these two theories viz. theory of transformation or

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy
that of production, it should be accepted that cognition does not originate illumination.
Similarly, the cognition is not produced either. If cognition is accepted as producible, then it will become inert due to the same reason.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

ननु रूपादिविषयैश्चक्षुरादिसंप्रयोगानन्तरं रूपादिविषयं ज्ञानं दृश्यते तर्हि तस्य का गतिरिति चेत्, नैष दोषः ज्ञानस्य जन्यत्वप्रतीतेर्भ्रान्तिरूपत्वात् । कस्मात् ? विषयाकारपरिणतान्तः करणवृत्तिर्हि चैतन्येऽपि स्फटिकादौ लौहित्यमिवावभासते । अतो भ्रान्तिरेव ज्ञाने जन्यत्वप्रतीतिः । एवं घटादिविषयस्फुरणरूपस्य भानस्यापि जन्यत्वप्रतीतिर्भ्रान्तिरेव तस्याप्युत्पत्तिमद्वृत्तिज्ञानान्वयव्यतिरेकानुविधायित्वेन तस्यैव जन्यत्वस्य तत्रावभासनात्। तस्मादजन्यत्वाद् विज्ञानं सत्यमेव तदभेदाद्भानमपि सत्यमेव ।
तथा चायं प्रयोगः-

- विमतं सत्यं,
- भावत्वे सत्यजन्यत्वात्,
- आत्मवत् ।

अत एव न प्रागभावे अनेकान्तिकता तस्य भावत्वाभावात् । तस्मात् तदिदं भानमेव चिन्मात्ररूपः साक्षीत्यनवद्यम् ।

Tatparya dipika

(Objection) But, the cognition of form etc. is observed to take place after the contact of senses like eyes etc. with objects like form etc. If cognition were regarded as a non-product, what would be the explanation of this phenomenon?
(Reply) It is not any fallacy. The understanding of production of cognition is only an illusion. The functioning of the internal sense organ, which has taken the form of the external object, gets reflected even in the consciousness (samvit) like the redness in the crystal. Therefore, the observation of production of cognition is illusion only.
Similarly, the observation that the illumination, in the form of knowledge of objects like pot etc., is producible is also an illusion. This observation is due to the produced functioning of

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

the internal sense organ, which can be ascertained by the process of positive and negative concomitance. The production of this functioning is attributed to the cognition itself.
Therefore, as it is not a product, the cognition is real indeed.
The syllogistic expression of this is as follows:

> The point of controversy (cognition) is real.
> Because, while being existent,
> it is a non-product like the self.

For this reason only, there will be no inconsistency (overapplication) of this in the prior- negation also, because that negation itself is not real. (The prior-negation is beginningless and is not an existent one).
Thus, it is proper to accept that this illumination alone is the perceptive pure consciousness (samvit).

तात्पर्यदीपिका

अतः सर्वेषु शरीरेष्वात्मत्वेनावस्थितः सर्वस्य जडप्रपञ्चस्यावभासकतया चिन्मात्ररूपः साक्षी यः परमात्मा स एवाहमस्मि न च दृश्यवस्तु । देहादिकं नास्ति। तस्य स्वरूपयाथात्म्यज्ञानेन बाध्यमानत्वात् । एवं यस्य दृढा प्रज्ञाऽस्ति = किमिदं प्रज्ञानस्य दार्ढ्यम् ? यथा बहुजन्मसु दृढं भावितत्वेनास्मिन् जन्मनि विनैव परोपदेशं कामादय नोत्पद्यन्ते तथा दीर्घकालनैरन्तर्यसत्कारैर्भाविते तत्त्वे पश्चाद् वाक्ययुक्ति परामर्शमन्तरेणैव पुरोवर्तिघटादिवत् सहसा तत्त्वं परिस्फुरति चेत् तदिदं प्रज्ञानस्य दार्यं नाम। एतादृशतत्त्वज्ञानं यस्यास्ति स तु ब्रह्मैवेति कृत्वा चण्डालोऽस्तु इति ।

Tatparya dipika

Therefore, I am the supreme self, who is present in all bodies as the self and who is pure consciousness illuminating the entire inert world and who is the perceptive consciousness. I am not the perceivable object. This means that I am not the body etc. Because, after the realization of one's own nature, the external body etc., gets nullified. Whoever has this thorough realization, may it be an outcaste or a Brahmin, he is my preceptor. This is my firm conviction.
In this sentence, what is the thoroughness of realization? It is like this- in so many births when one ponders firmly over the reality, even without other's instructions he does not get passion etc.in the present birth. In that way when the reality is pondered over

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

firmly for a long time, consistently while performing the meritorious deeds, then without the need of consideration of the logic of sentences, the reality shines forth at once like an external object like pot etc. this is called the thoroughness of realization. To indicate that whosoever has this realization, he is the Brahman only, the words like may it be an outcaste etc. are used in the verse.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

तल्लक्षणं स्मर्यते- शूद्राद्विप्राङ्गनायां तु चण्डालो नाम जायत इति । **द्विजो वास्तु गुरुरिति मम मनीषा** ।

ननु चण्डालस्य कथं गुरुत्वमिति चेन्न,

नित्यशुद्धासङ्गात्मविज्ञानेन जातिकुलाद्यभिमाननिवृत्तेः सोऽन्त्यजोऽपि शुद्ध एव ।

तथा च स्मर्यते-

न कुलं वृत्तहीनस्य प्रमाणमिति मे मतिः ।
अन्त्येष्वपि च जातानां वृत्तमेव विशिष्यते ।। इति ।

अतो ब्रह्मात्मैक्ये न किञ्चिद् बाधकमिति भावः ।

Tatparya dipika

The definition of an outcaste is stated in the Smrti texts as under: A person born to a low caste man from a Brahmin lady is called an outcaste. May it be a Chandala or a Brahmin; my firm conviction is that he is my preceptor.
It may be objected as to how can an outcaste be a preceptor. By the realization of the eternal, pure and unattached self, when the false identification of religion, caste etc. vanishes, that outcaste also is pure only. Thus, it is stated in the scriptures:

My view is that the caste of a characterless person is no proof at all.

In the outcaste also, it is the character that is important.
Therefore, the idea is that there is no contradiction at all to the identity of the individual self with the supreme self.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Oneness of the Individual self and the Brahman
जीवीत्मपरमात्मनोरैक्यम्

तात्पर्यदीपिका

ननु यतो वा इमानि भूतानि जायन्ते इत्यादिना ब्रह्मणो जगत्कारणत्व-श्रवणात् प्रत्यगात्मनस्तदन्तर्भावात् कथमुभयोरैक्यमिति चेत्,
नायं दोषः त्रिगुणात्मिकाविद्यासध्रीचीनेन प्रत्यगात्मना द्रट्रा स्वप्नप्रपञ्चवत् सर्वस्य सेश्वरस्य दृश्यजातस्यापि कल्पितत्वात् । तदुक्तम्

यथा स्वप्नप्रपञ्चोऽयं मयि मायाविजृम्भितः ।
एवं जाग्रत्प्रपञ्चोऽपिं मयि मायाविजृम्भितः ।।

एवं प्रम्यगात्मनो जगत्कारणत्वसंभवात् परब्रह्मत्वं संघटते। अपि च तत् सृष्ट्वा तदावानुप्राविशत् । अनेन जीवेनात्मनानुप्रविश्य नामरूपे व्याकरवाणि (तै,उ, 2-6-1) इत्यादिश्रुतेः परब्रह्मैव हि साक्षात् प्रत्यगात्मा । अत एव हि तत्त्वमस्यादिका श्रुतिर्जीवभावापन्नस्य यत् स्वाभाविकमद्वितीयं परब्रह्मात्मत्वं तत्प्रतिपादयन्ती जगत्कारणत्वोपाधिकं यत् सर्वज्ञत्वादिलक्षणं यच्चाज्ञानतत्कार्योपाधिकं सर्वप्रत्यग्रूपं चैतन्यं तदुभयमेकमेवेति सोऽयं देवदत्त इतिवद् विरुद्धांशपरिहारेणैक्यं बोधयति ।

Tatparya dipika

(Objection) From the scriptures ' that from which the beings are born' etc., the Brahman is known as the cause of the universe. The individual self is within that, so how can they both be one?
(Reply) This is not any fallacy at all. The perceptive self, associated with the avidya that is of the form of three constituents, fashioned, like the dream world, the entire objective world including the Isvara. This has been said in this way-
As the dream world is projected in me due to Maya or ignorance, Similarly, the wakeful-world is also projected in me due to maya only.
Thus, when the self is understood as the cause of the universe, the same may be understood as the absolute Brahman. Moreover, the scripture states that the self is the absolute Brahman with the sentences "having created that, (the Brahman) entered it verily" and "I shall divide the things with name and form, after entering them through this self" etc.
From these sentences also, the self should be realized as the absolute Brahman. For this reason only, the scriptural sentences

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

like 'that art thou' etc., propound the nature of the self as Brahman without a second and state the identity of consciousness characterized as omniscient etc. having the adjuncts like cause of the universe, with the absolute consciousness (samvit) having the adjuncts like ignorance and its products.
The scripture propounds this identity by way of removing the inconsistent elements as in the expression 'this is the same person by name Devadatta'.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

अत्र केचिदाहुः - आत्मनो जीवत्वं न भ्रान्तिसिद्धमपि तु स्वाभाविकमेवेति। तद्वार्तामात्रमेव स्यात् । तत् कस्मात् ? यद्यात्मनो जीवत्वं स्वाभाविकं स्यात् तर्हि तस्य मुक्त्यवस्थायामपि निवृत्तिर्न स्यात् स्वभावस्यानपायात् । अतो मुक्तानामपि सुखदुःखानुवृत्तिः स्यात् ।
ननु यथा आम्लसंपर्कात् ताम्रस्य स्वभावभूतं मलं निवर्तते एवं केनचित् परमेश्वर समाराधादिना साधनेन जीवस्य सुखदुःखादिसंसारानुभवात्मक जीवत्वनिवृत्तौ सत्यां परब्रह्मसायुज्यरूपा मुक्तिः किं न स्यादिति चेन्नैतत् सारम् । तत्कथं ? यथाऽग्नेः स्वभावभूतस्य दहनप्रकाशनादेर्विनाशो नास्ति, एवं स्वाभाविकस्य जीवत्वस्यापि विनाशो दुर्घट एव स्यात् ।

Tatparya dipika

In this regard some argue that the Atman being the Individual self is natural and not due to any illusion.
(To this our reply is) It is mere prattling because, if it is natural then that should never quit the self even in the state of emancipation. Because, one's nature never departs from one. Therefore, the pleasure and pain should continue even with the liberated selfs.
(Objection) One may say that, just as the impurity of the copper goes off in the contact of the acid, Similarly, the individual self-ness of the self, in the form of experience of the world of glee and gloom, goes off due to the various apparatus like devotion to the lord etc. Then, how is the emancipation in the form of oneness with the Supreme self not possible?
(Reply) This argument is not worthy. Just as the natural characteristic of the fire viz. burning and illuminating does not

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

perish, similarly, it is impossible indeed to establish that the natural individual self-ness of the self perishes.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

ननु मणिमन्त्रादिसामर्थ्यादग्नेरुष्णप्रकाशयोर्निवृत्तिमुपालभामहे तद्वत् साधनवैचित्र्यात् स्वाभाविक जीवत्वस्यापि निवृत्तिः किं न स्यात् ? इति चेत्, तदज्ञानविजृम्भितमेव स्यात् । तत् कस्य हेतोः ? अग्नेः स्वभावभूतमौष्ण्यादिकं मणिमन्त्रादिसामर्थ्यात् प्रतिबद्धमेव केवलं न तु नष्टम् । एवमेव सुखदुःखादि-लक्षणस्य स्वाभाविकस्य जीवत्वस्य केनचित् साधनेन प्रतिबन्ध एव स्यात् । न तु नाशः । तस्मादयं जीवो यदि परमार्थतो ब्रह्मणोऽन्यः स्यात् तर्हि साधनशतेनापि तस्य ब्रह्मभावो न घटत एव।

Tatparya dipika

(Objection) One may argue that the natural characteristic of the fire viz. burning and illuminating is observed to disappear due to the strength of the cooling stone, sacred incantations etc. Similarly, the natural individual self ness of the self can be stated to perish due to variety of apparatus.
(Reply) This is utter ignorance. Because, the natural characteristic of the fire also is only obstructed due to the strength of the cooling stone and sacred incantation etc. and it is not destroyed. Similarly, the nature of the self as individual self, in the form of experience of glee and gloom, should only be obstructed due to some factor and not be destroyed. Therefore, if the individual self is absolutely different from the Supreme self, then even by hundreds of apparatuses his becoming the Brahman cannot be proved.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

ननु न वयं जीवस्य ब्रह्मतादात्म्यलक्षणां मुक्तिं ब्रूमः, अपि तु तत् साम्यमिति केचिदिच्छन्ति । तद्वार्तामात्रमेव । कस्मात् ? विकल्पासहत्वात् । तथा हि जीवस्य किमेकदेशेन ब्रह्मसाम्यं विवक्षितमुताहो सर्वात्मना ? एकदेशेन चेत् संसारिणामपि जीवानामपि चेतनत्वादिनैकदेशेन परब्रह्मसाम्यसंभवादयत्नेन तेऽपि मुक्ताः स्युः । यदि सर्वेणैवाकारेण ब्रह्मसाम्यं विवक्षितं स्यात् तत् साम्यं न युज्यते। केनचिदाकारेण

 In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

व्यावृत्तयोरेव हि समानधर्मयोगादुपमानोपमेयभावः। इह तु सर्वात्मना समानयोर्जीवब्रह्मणोर्भेदजनकव्यावृत्ताकारविरहात् । इत एव भेदाभावाच्च जीवः परब्रह्मैव स्यान्न तु ब्रह्मसम इत्येतदनवद्यम् ।।1।।

Tatparya dipika

(Objection) Some desire to say that they do not state the emancipation as oneness with the Brahman but as similarity.
(Reply) This view is superficial. Because, it cannot withstand argument. It is in this way: what kind of similarity of the individual self with the supreme self is intended here? Is it partial or absolute?
If it is stated as partial then all the transmigratory selfs should get liberated without effort, as they also are similar to the Brahman partially with regard to their being conscious. Instead, if absolute similarity is intended even then it is not possible. Because, the relation of the standard of comparison and the object of comparison is possible between those two things, which are similar in few characteristics and different due to some other.
In the present view, when the individual and the supreme self are similar in all respects, there is nothing that can differentiate them mutually.
On this ground, when it is proved flawlessly that there is no difference between the individual self and the supreme self, the individual self is verily the supreme self and not similar. (1)

*****

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

श्रीशङ्करभगवत्पादविरचितम्

मनीषापञ्चकम्

श्लोकः-२

ब्रह्मैवाहमिदं जगच्च सकलं चिन्मात्रविस्तारितं
सर्वं चैतदविद्यया त्रिगुणया सेशं मया कल्पितम् ।
इत्थं यस्य दृढा मतिः सुखतरे नित्ये परे निर्मले
चण्डालोऽस्तु स तु द्विजोऽस्तु गुरुरित्येषा मनीषा मम ।। 2 ।।

"I am the Brahman, this entire world is an expansion of the Absolute consciousness (samvit) and I have imagined everything including the Isvara, due to the Avidya or nescience, in the form of three prime constituents viz. sattwa, rajas and tamas.'in this manner whoever has firm conviction in the absolute and pure eternal Brahman, of the form of Ultimate Bliss, may it be an outcaste or a Brahman, he is my preceptor. This is my firm conviction. (2)

तात्पर्यदीपिका

तस्मात् सच्चिदान्दैकरसः साक्षात्परमात्मैव सत्त्वपरिणाम-रूपनानाविधतत्तदन्तः करणोपहितः सन्ननपक्रान्तात्मभावेन नानाविधजीवभावं भजते। स च जीवभावापन्नस्यात्मनः परब्रह्मात्मतत्त्वज्ञानेन स्वस्वरूपस्याच्छादकं भावरूपाज्ञानं तत्कार्यं संसारं चात्ममात्रतया विलापयन् स्वयमेव स्वप्रकाशचिदानन्द-स्वरूपेणावशिष्यते । एवं प्रत्यग्ब्रह्मणोरैक्ये किं बाधकमित्यभिप्रेत्याह-

चिन्मात्र-विस्तारितमिति हेतुगर्भविशेषणं चिन्मात्रविस्तारितत्वात्। **त्रिगुणया**ऽविद्यया साधनेन **मया** प्रत्यगात्मना **सर्व** दृश्यजातं **सेश्वरं जगत् कल्पितं** यतः इतो जगदधिष्ठानभूतं चिन्मात्र **ब्रह्मैवाहमस्मि** । **इत्थम्** अनेन प्रकारेण **सुखतरे** निरतिशयानन्दैकरसे **नित्ये** ध्रुवेऽत एव **परे** सर्वोत्कृष्टेऽतएव च **निर्मले**ऽज्ञानतत्कार्यमलरहिते स्वप्रकाशचिदेकरसे ब्रह्मणि **यस्य** मुमुक्षो**र्मतिर्दृढा** भवति निरतिशयानन्द नित्यशुद्धस्वप्रकाश-चिदेकरसब्रह्मविषयसाक्षात्कारो दृढो भवति **स तु** नित्यशुद्ध ब्रह्मैवेति कृत्वा **चण्डालो वा** भवतु **द्विजो वा** भवतु **गुरुरिति मम मनीषे**त्यन्वयः ।
अतः प्रत्यग्ब्रह्मणोरैक्यं संघटत इति भावः ।

Tatparya dipika

Therefore, the supreme self alone, who is absolutely Existent, Conscious and Blissful, assumes the forms of various selfs due to the conditions like various inner sense organs, which are the modifications of the sattwa.

The supreme self never leaves the nature of being the self. That supreme self assumes the form of the individual self and by the strength of the realization of oneness of the individual self with the supreme self, withdraws in the self the positive nescience along with its evolute viz. the world, which conceals the true nature of the self. Then the supreme self alone remains in the self-illumining, conscious and blissful form.

Thus, where is the contradiction in the oneness of both the individual self and the supreme self? With this idea, the sage said in the verse' expansion of the absolute consciousness'. And this adjective contains the reason in it. It should be understood to mean' as it is expanded by the consciousness (samvit)'. With the strength of nescience that is of the form of three constituents, I, the individual self and the perceiver, have imagined the objective world along with the Isvara.

So, I am verily the absolute consciousness (samvit) that is the substratum of the world. In this way, if the mind of an aspirant gets firm on the absolute bliss, eternal and therefore, pure, self-luminant Brahman, may he be an outcaste or a Brahmin, he is my This is my firm conviction.

In this verse, pure means devoid of nescience and its evolutes. Similarly, the words 'mind getting firm' mean firm realization of the Brahman, who is absolutely blissful, eternal, pure, self-illumining and absolute consciousness (samvit). Thus, it should be construed. Therefore, the idea is that the oneness of both the individual self and the supreme self is plausible.

Falsity of the world (जगन्मिथात्वम्)

तात्पर्यदीपिका

नन्वेवमप्यविविसंवादिव्यवहारदर्शनात् आरोपितरजतादिवैलक्षण्यात् पारमार्थिकमेवेदं जगत् । अतः कथमद्वैतसिद्धिरिति चेन्न दृग्रूपेऽद्वैते ब्रह्मण्यध्यस्तत्वेन शुक्तिरूप्यवदसत्यत्वात् ।

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

ननु कथञ्चैतत् प्रपञ्चस्याध्यस्तत्वमिति चेत्, अविसंवादि-व्यवहारदर्शनेऽपि दृश्यत्वात् शुक्तिरूप्यवदिति ब्रूमः ।

न च दृश्यत्वहेतोः पक्षधर्मताऽसिद्धिरिति वाच्यम् । द्वैतप्रपञ्चस्य स्वतो जडत्वेन दृग्रूपेण स्वप्रकाशब्रह्मस्वरूपचैतन्येनावभास्यमानत्वाद् दृश्यत्वहेतुः कृत्स्नपक्षं व्याप्य वर्तत इत्येतत् सार्वपारिषदम् । तस्मादारोपित-द्वैतप्रपञ्चोऽसत्य एव ।

Tatparya dipika

(Objection) Even then the objective world should be accepted as absolutely real because it is the object of such undisputed cognition and different from the superimposed silver etc. So, how can the non-dualism be established?

(Reply) It is not right. Because, as it is superimposed on the Brahman that is the perceiver, the world is unreal like silver that is superimposed on the shell. So, the non-dualism can be established.

(Objection) How is this world stated to be superimposed on the Brahman?

(Reply) Though there is the undisputed cognition, the world is unreal as it is superimposed on the Brahman. Because, it is perceivable object like the silver on the shell.

(Objection) But, this reason is fallacious, because the subject-hood of this reason is unfounded (**paksa-dharmata- asiddhi**).

Note:

The presence of concomitant reason in the subject is Paksa dharmata as in the example- mountain is fiery, because there is smoke; the state *-that the smoke, which is concomitant with the fire, is on the mountain-* is called Paksadharmata. If such is not proved in the paksha, then it is a fallacy called asiddhi.)

[In the above syllogistic expression viz.

The world is superimposed;
Because, it is perceivable;
Like, silver in the place of shell.

The reason 'perceptibility' cannot prove the unreality of the world. Because, though it is perceived, the world is real according to the dualists.]

If there is no concomitance between both the reason and the Sadhya, it will be a fallacy called '***vyabhichara***= inconsistency'

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

and if a concomitant reason is not present in the paksha, it will be a fallacy called ***asiddhi.***
In the present case, with the help of 'perceptibility' the 'imposed nature' of the world is intended to be established. For this, the reason i.e. 'perceptibility' should be concomitant with 'imposed-ness' but the Dualists accept the world to be real. In that case, the reason will not have concomitance with imposed-ness. As a result, there will be the fallacy called ***Paksha-dharmata-asiddhi.*** This is the point here.

(Reply) It is not correct. Because, it is a universal tenet that the dual objective world is inert by itself and therefore, it is illuminated by the perceiver-consciousness (samvit) that is the self-illuminating Brahman. Thus, the reason inhabits the entire object. Therefore, the superimposed dual world is unreal only.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

नन्वेवमद्वतीयस्यात्मनोऽप्यसत्त्वं किं न स्यादिति चेन्न, अद्वितीयात्मनो दृग्रूपतया दृश्यत्वाभावेनाध्यस्तत्वासंभवात्। यद्यद्वैतमपि द्वैतवदध्यस्तं स्यात् तर्हि तस्य केनचिदधिष्ठानेन भवितव्यतम् । निरधिष्ठानभ्रमानुपपत्तेः । किं तदधिष्ठानम्? अद्वेतमेवोत द्वैतमपि ? न तावदग्रिमः, आरोप्याददद्वैतादन्यस्य अद्वैतान्तरस्य अभावात्। नापि चरमः, अद्वैतस्य केवलं कल्पिते द्वैतेऽध्या सासंभवात् लोके हि परमार्थभूते शुक्तिकशकलादौ रजताध्यासस्य दृष्टत्वात्। तदनुसारेण अद्वैताध्यासस्याप्यधिष्ठानत्वेन तत्त्वभूतमेव किञ्चिद्वक्तव्यम् । न परिकल्पितम् ।

Tatparya dipika

(Objection) How can then even the absolute self be not stated as non-existent?
(Reply) The self without a second is the perceiver and not the perceived. Therefore, it cannot be superimposed. If the non-dual also is superimposed like the dual, there should be some substratum for such superimposition. Because, in the absence of a substratum, illusion is not possible. What kind of a substratum is to be postulated here, non-dual alone or even the dual? The first is not possible because there is no non-dual thing other than the superimposed non-dual. Even the latter is not possible because, the non-dual cannot be superimposed on some mere imagined

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

dual thing. It is a matter of experience that the silver is also superimposed on some real piece of shell only. Therefore, with regard to the superimposition of the non-dual also some real thing must be stated as the substratum and not some imagined thing.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

ननु भवतु लोके सत्याधिष्ठानत्वम् । अद्वैताध्यासे अन्यस्यासंभवात् कल्पितस्यैवाधिष्ठानत्वमिति नियमः किं न स्यादिति चेन्न,
द्वैतस्याप्यध्यस्तैकशरीरत्वात् । अध्यस्तस्य चाधिष्ठानाद् ब्रह्मस्वरूपादनतिरेकात् एकस्यैवाधिष्ठानत्व-मारोप्यत्वञ्चेति व्याहतमेव प्रसज्येत । किञ्च, यदि द्वैताद्वैते उभेऽप्यारोपिते स्यातां तर्हि प्रपञ्चस्य तद्व्यतिरिक्तस्य वस्त्वन्तरस्य अभावान्निरधिष्ठानभ्रमः प्रसज्येत ।
ननु शून्यमेवोभयोरप्यधिष्ठानमस्तु इति चेन्न,
निःस्वरूपस्य शून्यस्य केनचिदाकारेण निर्वक्तुमशक्यत्वेन अधिष्ठानत्वबाधावधित्व लक्षणधर्मयोगासंभवात् । प्रपञ्चितमेतद् रत्नदीधितौ ।। 2 ।।

Tatparya dipika

(Objection) May there be the necessity of some real substratum of superimposition in general experience, but as a general rule why not accept an imagined substratum in the superimposition of the non-dual?
(Reply) It is not possible. Because, the dual also is a part of the superimposition. As the superimposed is not different from the substratum that is the Brahman, the same thing becomes both the superimposed and the substratum of such superimposition. It is absolutely illogical. Moreover, if both the dual and the non-dual were taken as superimposed, then on account of the absence of the external world and a thing other than itself, there would rise the problem in the form of an illusion without a substratum.
(Objection) Then, accept the void ness as the substratum of both the dual and the non-dual.
(Reply) Void ness cannot be accepted as the substratum, because, it is formless and indescribable. As such it cannot possess the characteristic of being the limit of the contradiction. This topic is elucidated in an Advaita text called 'Ratnadidhiti'. (2)

*****

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

श्रीशङ्करभगवत्पादविरचितम्

मनीषापञ्चकम्

श्लोकः-३

शश्वन्नश्वरमेव विश्वमखिलं निश्चित्य वाचा गुरो
र्नित्यं ब्रह्म निरन्तरं विमृशता निर्व्याजशान्तात्मना ।
भूतं भावि च दुष्कृतं प्रदहता संविन्मये पावके
प्रारब्धाय समर्पितं स्ववपुरित्येषा मनीषा मम ।। 3 ।।

By the words of the preceptor, having ascertained that the entire world is absolutely perishable, pondering over the Brahman always with utmost sincere quiet mind and burning the past and present sins in the fire of consciousness (samvit), the self-realized has offered his body to the *prarabdha* karma. This is my firm conviction. (3)

तात्पर्यदीपिका

तस्मादद्वैतस्याध्यासासंभवाद् द्वैतस्य चाद्वैते स्वप्रकाशचिदेकरसे ब्रह्मण्यध्यस्तत्वेन असत्यत्वात् सत्यज्ञानानन्दैकरसमेकम द्वितीयं ब्रह्मैवावशिष्यते । अतो न काचनानुपपत्तिरित्यभिप्रेत्याह **शश्वदिति** ।

गुरोर्वाच इदं विश्वं शश्वत् अनुक्षणं **नश्वरमेवेति निश्चित्य नित्यम्** कालत्रयाबाध्यं निरस्तसमस्तप्रपञ्चं स्वप्रकाशचिदेकरसं सदानन्दघनमद्वितीयं **ब्रह्म** यत् तदेवाहमस्मीति **निरन्तरमेतद्** दीर्घकालादेरप्युपलक्षणं **विमृशता** विमर्शोऽत्र भावना। अत एव भगवान् पतञ्जलिरेतदसूत्रयत्-आदरनैरन्तर्य दीर्घकालसत्काराऽसेवितो दृढभूमिरिति । तथा चायमर्थः संपन्नः - विधिवत् सर्वकर्माणि संन्यस्य नैरन्तर्यदीर्घकालसत्कारैः दृढमसङ्गचिद्रूपमखण्डैकरसं ब्रह्माहमिति भावयेदिति ।

Tatparya dipika

Therefore, since the un-dual cannot be superimposed and the dual is unreal as it is superimposed on the un-dual Brahman, that is self-illumining and absolutely conscious, there remains the un-dual Brahman, that is reality, cognition, absolute bliss and without any kind of difference. So, there is no fallacy at all. With

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

this idea, the sage said in the verse 'always'. Having ascertained on the words of the preceptor that the world is perishable always i.e., every moment, one should reflect on that as I am the eternal Brahman i.e., undisputed in all the three divisions of time and devoid of any kind of expansion or modification, that is absolutely self- illumining, conscious and blissful. This reflection should be uninterrupted.
This is indicative of long-time reflection also.
Reflection here means Bhavana or intense imagination.
Therefore, the revered sage Patanjali has aphorized as' (the practise becomes) deep rooted when done for a long time uninterruptedly along with the performance of good deeds'.
Thus, the following meaning evolves:
Having renounced all kinds of deeds according to the sacred injunctions, one should practice the intense imagination in the form of I am the Brahman that is absolutely intangible consciousness (samvit), by the strength of uninterrupted long-time performance of good deeds.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

ब्रह्मभावनाप्रकारस्तु भगवत्पादैरेव दर्शितः-

दृशिस्वरूपं गगनोपमं परं सकृद्विभातं त्वजमेकमक्षरम् ।
अलेपकं सर्वगतं यदद्वयं तदेव चाहं सततं विमुक्त ओम् ।। इति ।।

Tatparya dipika

Bhagavan Adisankara himself had shown the process of reflecting on the Brahman with these words: The un-dual Reality is perceiver, compared with the sky, above all, self- illumining, without a second, without birth, imperishable, intangible, and all-pervading. I am verily that Reality and liberated always. Om.

Knowledge not auxiliary to action
ज्ञानस्य न कर्माङ्गत्वम्

तात्पर्यदीपिका

ननु कथं सर्वकर्मसंन्यासित्वं घटते ज्ञानकर्मणोरङ्गाङ्गिभावेन समुच्चयसंभवादिति चेन्नैतत् सारम् । उभयोः परस्परविरोधात् । तथा हि सर्वानर्थप्रपञ्चस्य मूलभूतं

प्रत्यगात्मनः पारमार्थिकपरब्रह्मस्वरूपत्वाच्छादकम् अज्ञानम् । तस्मिन् सविलासे सत्येव कर्म तत्प्रसादेन स्वात्मानं लभते ।
औपनिषदमद्वितीयात्मज्ञानं त्वज्ञानं तत्कार्यं च प्रत्यगात्मन्युपाधिवशाद् भासमानकर्मापेक्षितकर्तृत्वभोक्तृत्वादिसकलानर्थं विलापयदेवाविर्भवति । तथा च ज्ञानकर्मणोः सहावस्थानविरोधाद् अङ्गाङ्गिभावेन सहावस्थानं (न) घटत एव ।

Tatparya dipika

(Objection) When an admixture of Knowledge and Performance of deeds (Jnana and Karma) is possible due to their being principal and secondary, how is the renunciation of all deeds possible?
(Reply) It is not reasonable. Because, knowledge and the performance of deeds are mutually contradictory. The contradiction is like this:
The origin of all adversities is nescience, which conceals the true nature of the absolute Brahman. Only the Avidya being fervent, the Karma, being empowered by it assumes its form. But the un-dual self-realization arising from the Upanishadic sentences manifests itself while obliterating the nescience and its effect. The effect of Avidya is in the form of doer ship, enjoyer hood etc., appearing in the individual self, due to conditions. Thus, knowledge and action cannot exist together; Therefore, their co-existence being mutually principal and secondary is not possible.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

अपि च स्वर्गपशुपुत्रादिकं स्वल्पमेव फलं कर्म प्रयच्छति ज्ञानं तु परमानन्दावाप्तिलक्षणं परिपूर्णं फलं प्रयच्छति, अतोऽधिकफलं ज्ञानं न्यूनफलस्य कर्मणोऽङ्गमिति– एतन्न युक्तम् । अफलस्य हि प्रयाजादेः कैमर्थ्यवशात् फलवत्सन्निधावफलं तदङ्गमितिन्यायेन फलवदाग्नेयादियागशेषत्वं दृश्यते । ज्ञानस्य तु पृथक् फलसद्भावस्य श्रुतत्वेन फलाकाङ्क्षाया अभावात्, नास्य शेषत्वम् ।

Tatparya dipika

Moreover, action yields limited fruit only in the form of heaven, property, issues etc., whereas knowledge grants the complete fruit in the form of absolute bliss.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Therefore, it is not proper to say that the knowledge, which gives the unlimited fruit, is secondary to the action, which gives limited fruit only.

The prayaja and other deeds become auxiliary to the sacrifices called Darsa-purnamasa, as the scriptures have enjoined no separate result for these prayaja. It is observed that the fruitless prayaja etc. are ancillary to the fruitful sacrifices like agneya etc, due to expectancy of the fruit, by virtue of the Mimamsa aphorism' in the association of the fruitful deed, the fruitless deed becomes its auxiliary part.'

But knowledge has been stated in the scriptures to have a separate fruit and hence cannot be auxiliary to the action, due to the absence of expectancy of fruit.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

ननु यथा प्रयाजविधिर्वाक्यशेषेण तेन वर्म वा एतद्यज्ञाय क्रियते इत्यादिना श्रुतस्य फलस्याङ्गेषु फलश्रुतिरर्थवाद इति न्यायेनार्थवादार्थम् । तथा ज्ञानफलस्याप्यर्थ-वादत्वात् प्रयाजादिवदङ्गत्वं किं न स्यात् ?

Tatparya dipika

(Objection) The injunction of the prayaja is for arthavada of the fruit enjoined by the scriptures with the words 'varma va etad yajnaya kriyate' etc., by the strength of vakya shesa or remnant of the sentence and of the maxim that arthavada is the injunction of the fruit in the subsidiary acts. Similarly, why not accept subsidiary-ness to the fruit of knowledge as arthavada like the prayaja acts?

तात्पर्यदीपिका

इति चेन्न - प्रयाजादेर्हि दर्शपूर्णमासप्रकरणपठितत्वेन अङ्गभावस्य निर्णीतत्त्वाद् युक्तं तदीयफलश्रवण स्यार्थवादत्वम् । न तथा ज्ञानं कस्यचित् कर्मणः प्रकरणे स्थितं येन फलश्रुतेरर्थवादता कल्प्येत । अतः प्रकरणभेदादपि ज्ञानस्य न कर्माङ्गत्वम् ।

Tatparya dipika

(Reply) It cannot be. Because, considering the injunction of the prayaja acts as arthavada is proper because their subsidiary-ness is ascertained as they are read in the Darsapurnamasa context.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy
But knowledge is not read as subsidiary in the context of any act. Had it been so, the fruit of knowledge would have been imagined for arthavada. So, due to difference in contexts also knowledge cannot be subsidiary to action.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

अपि च स्वर्गपुत्रादिफलरागयुक्तः कर्मण्यधिकारी ज्ञाने तु वैरागययुक्त इत्यधिकारिविशेषमुपादाय प्रवृत्तत्वाज्ञानस्य न कर्माङ्गत्वम्। स्वरूपभेदाच्च। अज्ञानकार्यत्वात् कर्माप्रकाशकम्। स्वप्रकाशात्मकब्रह्मात्मकत्वात् ज्ञानं प्रकाशात्मकम्। तथा च तमः प्रकाशयोरिवानयोः सहावस्थानानुपपत्त्या कथमङ्गाङ्गि-भावेन समुच्चयः संभवति । तस्मात् सर्वकर्मसंन्यासः सम्यगुपपद्यते ।

Tatparya dipika

Moreover, one who is deeply interested in the fruits like heaven, progeny etc., is qualified to perform the acts. One who is totally detached from such fruits is eligible for knowledge. Thus, since knowledge functions with regard to the particular eligible person, it cannot be subsidiary to the action. Even due to the different nature of knowledge, it cannot be subsidiary to the action. The action is not illuminating as it is an evolute of nescience. Knowledge is illuminating as it is the self-illuminating Brahman. Thus, when there is no possibility at all of co-existence of knowledge and the action, like between darkness and light, a synthesis of both of them as subsidiary and principal is also impossible.

Therefore, appropriate is the renunciation of all deeds. (Karmasannyasa).

तात्पर्यदीपिका

अत एव श्रुतिस्मृतयो विविदिषाविद्वत्प्रभेदेन परमहंससंन्यासं प्रतिपादयन्ति एतमेव प्रव्राजिनो लोकमिच्छन्तः प्रव्रजन्ति । एवं वै तमात्मानं विदित्वा ब्राह्मणाः पुत्रैषणायाश्च लोकैषणायाश्च व्युत्थायाथ ब्रह्मचर्यां चरन्ति इत्येवमाद्याः । अतः सुष्ठुक्तं निरन्तरं विमृशतेति । निरन्तरं निरतिशयानन्दब्रह्मभावनाया मुपायमुपदर्शयन्नाह-निर्व्याजशान्तात्मनेति - निर्गतो व्याजः दम्भः (यस्मात् सः) दम्भो वर्षादिरप्युप-

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

लक्षणम्। शान्तो नष्टः आत्मा मनः (तेन) तथा च दम्भदर्पाद्यशुभवासनाक्षयो मनोनाशश्च यस्य विदुषस्तेनेत्यर्थः ।

Tatparya dipika

For this reason only, the scriptures expound, as vividas and vidvat (a desire to know is vividias and knower in vidivat) the renunciation of the l'aramahamsa kind with the words' having realized this Self in this way, the realized selfs detach themselves from the desire for progeny and worldly matters and then live in the Brahman' etc.

So, it is aptly said in the verse with the words' contemplating over incessantly' With a view to indicate the means of incessant contemplation over the Brahman that is absolute bliss, the sage said with the words' by a mind that is quiet and devoid of hypocrisy' The compound nirynja should be understood to mean 'one who is devoid of hypocrisy'.

Here, the word hypocrisy is indicative of the feelings like pride etc. The compound shanta atma means the quiet-minded. Thus, the compound means that such pure-self should make the contemplation over the Brahman, whose impure impressions like hypocrisy, pride etc., are destroyed and whose mind is absorbed in the Brahman ultimately.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

ननु का ता वासना मनसः कथं नाम तयोर्नाश इति चेत् तच्छृणु- पूर्वापरमन्तरेण सहसोत्पद्यमानस्य दम्भदर्पादिवृत्तिविशेषस्य हेतुश्चित्तगतसंस्कारो वासनाः पूर्वाभ्यासेन चित्तस्य वास्यमानत्वात् ।

तदुक्त-

दृढभावनया त्यक्तपूर्वापरविचारणम् ।
यदादानं पदार्थस्य वासना सा प्रकीर्तिता ।।

Tatparya dipika

What are these vasana of mind and how are these (mind & tendencies) destroyed? If one asks this question, the Reply is this: vasana are impressions in the mind that cause the thought waves like hypocrisy, pride etc., which arise at once. without consideration to the pros and cons. They are so called because

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

they are infused by the previous practise of the mind Hence it is said:
Without consideration to the pros and cons, the acceptance of things due to strong feeling is Vasana.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

तस्याः वासनायाः क्षयो नाम विवेकजन्यायाममानित्वादिदैववासनायां दृढायां सत्यां बाह्यनिमित्तेन दम्भाद्यनुपपत्तिः । प्रदीपज्वालासंतानवद् वृत्तिसंतानरूपेण परिणममानमन्तः करणद्रव्यं मननात्मकत्वान्मन इत्युच्यते । तस्य च मनसो नाशो नाम वृत्तिरूपपरिणामं परित्यज्य निरुद्धाकारेण परिणामः । तथा च योगशास्त्रे पतञ्जलिः सूत्रयामास – **व्युत्थाननिरोध-संस्कारयोरभिभव-प्रादुर्भावनिरोधक्षण-चित्तान्वयो निरोधपरिणामः (3-9)** इति ।
व्युत्थानसंस्कारा अभिभूयन्ते निरोधसंस्कारा आविर्भवन्ति । निरोधलक्षणास्तु चित्तेन अन्वार्यन्ते । सोऽयं मनोनाश इत्यवगन्तव्यम् । तत्र मनोनाशाभावे वृत्तिषूत्पद्यमानासु कदाचिद् बाह्यनिमित्तेन दम्भाद्युत्पत्तेर्नास्ति वासनाक्षयः । अक्षीणायां च वासनायां तथैव वृत्त्युत्पादनान्नास्ति मनोनाशः ।
तथा चोक्तम्-

यावद्विलीनं न मनो न तावद्वासनाक्षयः ।
न क्षीणा वासना यावच्चित्तं तावन्न शाम्यति ।।

तथा च मनसो दम्भादिवृत्त्यनुदयान्मनो नश्यति । अनेन वासनाक्षय-मनोनाशयोरपि परस्परसाधनत्वमुक्तं भवतीति द्रष्टव्यम् ।

Tatparya dipika

'Destruction of this mind' means the non-arise of hypocrisy etc., due to external stimuli, when the divine tendencies like ego lessness etc., born from the discrimination, get deep rooted. The substantial internal sense organ modifying in the form of the flow of thought waves like the continuous flames of a lamp is called Mind or manas due to its functioning of thinking. Its destruction means its inhibitive change in the form of nirodha parinama abandoning its exhibitive change in the form of vrtti or functioning. This, sage Patanjali aphorized in the following manner:

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

The inhibitive change of the mind means the dissolution of the exhibitive impressions and evolution of the inhibitive impressions, connected with the mind of the inhibitive moment. (Yogasutra III-9).

The exhibitive impressions get dissolved and the inhibitive evolve. And the inhibitive dissolve along with the mind. This should be understood as the destruction of the mind. There also, when mind is not destroyed and the mental activities continue to evolve then there is no destruction of the impressions due to the arise of hypocrisy etc. caused by external stimuli. When the impressions are not attenuated, there is no destruction of the mind since the mental thought- waves continue to evolve.

Hence it is said:

As long as the mind is not dissolved there is no destruction of the impressions. As long as the impressions exist, there is no mental quietude.

So, the mind dissolves when it's functioning like hypocrisy etc., does not arise. It should be noticed here that the attenuation of the impressions and destruction of the mind are stated here as causes of each other.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

नन्वस्त्वेतद् वासनाक्षयमनोनाशयोर्ज्ञानसाधनत्वं क्व प्रसिद्धम् ? इति चेत्, श्रुतिस्मृतिष्विति ब्रूमः ।

तथा हि-

आसुरवासनाक्षयकारिण्याः दैववासनायास्तत्त्व ज्ञानसाधनत्वं श्रुतिस्मृत्योरुपलभ्यते । शान्तो दान्त उपरतस्तितिक्षुः समाहितो भूत्वा आत्मन्येवात्मानं पश्यति इति श्रुतिः । (बृहदारण्यक - 4-4-23)

स्मृतिरपि च-

अमानित्वमदम्भित्वमहिंसा क्षान्तिरार्जवम् ।
आचार्योपासनं शौचं स्थैर्यमात्मविनिग्रहः ।।
इन्द्रियार्थेषु वैराग्यमनहङ्कार एव च ।
जन्ममृत्युजराव्याधिदुःखदोषानुदर्शनम् ।।
असक्तिरनभिष्वङ्गः पुत्रदारागृहादिषु ।
नित्यं च समचित्तत्वमिष्टानिष्टोपपत्तिषु ।।

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

मयि चानन्ययोगेन भक्तिरव्यभिचारिणी ।
विविक्तदेशसेवित्वमरतिर्जनसंसदि ।।
अध्यात्मज्ञाननित्यत्वं तत्त्वज्ञानार्थदर्शनम् ।
एतज्ज्ञानमिति प्रोक्तमज्ञानं यदतोऽन्यथा ।।
(भगवद्गीता.13.7-11)

अन्यस्मिन्नहंबुद्धिरभिष्वङ्गः । ज्ञायतेऽनेनेति व्युत्पत्त्या ज्ञानसाधनमित्यर्थः। मनोनाशस्यापि ज्ञानसाधनत्वं श्रुतिस्मृतिप्रसिद्धम् । ततस्तु तं पश्यते निष्कलं ध्यायमान इति श्रुतेः, अध्यात्मयोगाधिगमेन देवं मत्वा धीरो हर्षशोकौ जहाति इति च । प्रत्यगात्मसमाधिप्रास्येत्यर्थः ।

यं विनिद्रा जितश्वासाः संतुष्टाः संयतेन्द्रियाः ।
ज्योतिः पश्यन्ति युञ्जानास्तस्मै विद्यात्मने नमः ।। इति श्रुतेः ।

Tatparya dipika

(Objection) Let it be so. Still where it is established that the attenuation of tendencies and the destruction of the mind are means to knowledge?

(Reply)We say that it is established in the shruti and the Smrti. It is in this way:

In the Shruti and the Smrti it is expounded that the divine tendency that annihilates the demonic tendency is a means to the realization. The Shruti states' one who is self-controlled internally and externally, detached, tolerant and quiet, he perceives the self within the self.'

The smriti also states:

Means of True knowledge (according to the Bhagavad Gita):

- Egoless-ness;
- lack of hypocrisy;
- non-violence;
- tolerance;
- straightforwardness;
- devotion to the preceptors;
- purity;
- bravery;
- self-control;
- detachment towards the external objects;

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

- lack of egoism;
- considering the miseries caused by birth-death-old age-diseases,
- detachment;
- lack of false identification with own children- wife and property,
- equipoised mind always in glee and gloom;
- unflinching devotion towards Me (the Lord);
- living in solitary places;
- disinterest in public gatherings;
- living always in the contemplation on the Self and
- incessant contact with the reality;

all this is called Knowledge (means of true knowledge) and other than this is simply Ignorance.

In this verse, the word 'abhishvanga' means false identification. The word 'jnana' means a means of knowledge, on the basis of the etymological explanation' that is jnana by which something is known'.

The annihilation of the mind is well known as the means of knowledge in the Scriptures like Shruti and Smrti with the words' then the yogin realizes the absolute self, contemplating on it.' And' the brave give up happiness and sorrow after knowing the self through the acquisition of spiritual oneness'.

In this sentence, the meaning of the phrase' after knowing the self through the acquisition of the spiritual oneness' means' after realizing the self through the acquisition of the spiritual absorption.'

The scripture also states: "My salutations to that effulgence in the form of knowledge, which the alert (without sleep) and content yogin perceive in the state of spiritual absorption after controlling the breath and senses."

तात्पर्यदीपिका

इत्थं तत्त्वज्ञानस्य साधनं प्रदर्श्य फलं प्रदर्शयन्नाह - भूतं भावि च दुष्कृतं प्रदहता संविन्मये पावक इति । भूतमप्रवृत्तफलं जन्मान्तरसञ्चितम्। अस्मिन्नपि जन्मनि प्राग् ज्ञानोत्पत्तेः संञ्चितं भावि च ब्रह्मसाक्षात्कारादूर्ध्वं देहेन्द्रियव्यापारवशात् संभावितं च दुष्कृतं संविन्मये स्वप्रकाशचिदेकरसे सर्वाधिष्ठानभूते पावके ब्रह्माग्नौ प्रदहेत्

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy
स्वव्यतिरेकेण अभावादिति प्रविलापयेदित्यर्थः । नाभुक्तं क्षीयते कर्म कल्पकोटिशतैरपि इति पापविनाशस्य सर्वशास्त्रसिद्धत्वात् ।

Tatparya dipika

Thus, having demonstrated the means of knowledge of reality, the revered sage now proceeds to demonstrate the result of that knowledge with the words
'Destroying the past and future sins in the fire of the consciousness (samvit)'. Here past sin means sin that is accumulated through many previous births, whose result has not yet begun to actualize. The sin that got accumulated before the rise of self-knowledge and that may probably take place due to the functioning of the body and senses even after realization of the Brahman. These are the past and the future sins which the yogin is expected to destroy in the fire of sanctifying Brahma consciousness (samvit) that is self-effulgent and the substratum of everything.
Here, destroying means cancelling them as they do not have existence independent of the self. Because, it is well known in all the sciences that, without being experienced, the karma of an individual does not get annihilated even after countless years.

Non-Anointment of sin to the Brahmajna
ब्रह्मज्ञानिनः पापलेपः नास्ति

तात्पर्यदीपिका

ब्रह्मज्ञानिनोऽप्यस्ति पापलेप इति चेन्न, अत्र तावद् ब्रह्मात्मतत्त्वविदः पापलेशशङ्काऽपि नोदेति ।
नाकार्षम् न करोमि न करिष्यामीति कालत्रयेऽप्यकर्तृब्रह्मस्वरूपत्वेन निश्चितत्वात्। न ह्यकर्तुः पापलेशं मन्दा अपि शङ्कन्ते । कुतः ? अश्लेषविनाशयोः श्रुतत्वात् । श्रूयते हि ब्रह्मसाक्षात्कारादूर्ध्वं देहेन्द्रियव्यवहारवशात् संभावितस्या-पापस्य लेशः- तद्यथा पुष्करपलाश आपो न श्लिष्यन्त एवमेवंविदि पापं कर्म न श्लिष्यत इति । साक्षात्कारात्पूर्वमिह जन्मनि जन्मान्तरेषु च संञ्चितस्य पापसंघस्य विनाशः श्रूयते - तद्यथेषिकातूलमग्नौ प्रोतं प्रदूयतैवं हास्य सर्वे पाप्मानः प्रदूयन्त (5.24.3) इति । अत एव भगवान् बादरायणः - तदधिगम उत्तरपूर्वाघयोर-श्लेशविनाशौ तद्व्यपदेशात्

(4.1 13) इत्यधिकरणेनैतत् प्रतिपादयामास। नाभुक्तमित्यादिशास्त्रं तु ब्रह्मज्ञानरहितविषयम् । तस्मान्नास्ति ब्रह्मज्ञानिनः पापलेपः ।

Tatparya dipika

Then does it mean that the one who realized the Brahman also get sin? The (Advaitins) Reply is no. Because, here in fact does not arise the doubt of even an iota of sin in the one who has realized the oneness of the self and the Brahman.

Because, 'I did not do anything - I do not do anything- I shall not do anything' this way he has realized himself as the Brahman who cannot be a doer in the three divisions of time. Even the dull-witted do not suspect even a whit of sin to a non-doer.

How? From the scriptural sentences, the non-clinging and destruction are heard.

The scripture states the non-clinging of sin occurring possibly due to the functioning of the body and the senses, even after the realization that the self is the Brahman, with the words' just as the water drops do not cling to the lotus leaf, the sin also does not cling to the realized-one.'

The scripture states the annihilation of the sin accumulated in this birth or the previous many births with the words' just as the dry grass and the cotton-bundle get reduced to ashes in the fire, all sins (of the realized) get burnt.

Therefore, sage Badarayana also supported this view in the section called tadadhigama in the Brahmasutra and aphorized: Immediately after the realization, there is no clinging to the sins of this birth and there is the annihilation of the accumulated sins of previous births. (Brahmasutra IV-I-13) The pronouncement that the deeds do not wane away without being experienced pertains to a person who has not realized the Brahman.

Therefore, there is no adherence of sin to a knower of the Brahman.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

ननु मा भूत् पापलेपः पुण्यलेपस्तु विद्यते पुण्यस्य श्रौतत्वेन श्रौतब्रह्मज्ञानेन सहाविरोधादिति चेन्न, अकर्त्रात्मवस्तुबोधसामर्थ्यात् पापवत् पुण्येनापि न लिप्यते। पापवत् पुण्यमपि जन्महेतुत्वात् पापसममेवेति पापत्वेनैव श्रुतिः परामृशति - सर्वे पाप्मानोऽतो निवर्तन्त इति । किञ्च उभे उ एवैष एते तरतीति श्रुतिः

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

पुण्यपापयोरुभयोर्ज्ञानिना तरणं सममेव ब्रूते । अत एव भगवान् बादरायणः इतरस्याप्येवमसंश्लेषः पाते तु (ब्रह्मसूत्रम् 4.1.14)इत्यधिकरणेन ज्ञानिनः पुण्येनापि न लिप्यन्त इत्यूचे । अतो मूले दुष्कृतपदं सुकृतस्याप्युपलक्षणमिति व्याख्येयम् ।

Tatparya dipika

(Objection) let there be no adherence of sin to the Knower of the Brahman but that of merit should be there. Because, merit that is expounded in the scriptures is not contradictory to the knowledge of the Brahman expounded in the scriptures.
(Reply) It is not correct. On the strength of the realization of the self that is non-doer, the knower is not defiled even by merit as he is not defiled by sin. Merit is similar to the sin since merit also causes birth.
Thus, considering the merit as sin, the scripture states' all the sins regress from this'. More over the scripture states that the realized has to transgress over the merit and the sin equally, with the words this self-realized transgresses both of these (merit and sin)'.
Therefore, revered sage Badarayana inveterates that even merit does not defile the self-realized, with the words of the other also (merit), there is no clinging but after death' (Brahmasutra-IV-I-14) in the Itara samshlesha- adhikarana. Therefore, the word sin in the original should be explained as indicative of the merit also.

Nullification of the initiated deed (prarabdha)

प्रारब्धनाशः

ननु ज्ञानात्पूर्वं सञ्चितपुण्यपापे द्विविधे आरब्धफले च । तयोर्द्विविधयोरपि अकर्तृत्वमात्मनः समानम् । तद्बाधश्च समः । ततोऽनारब्धवदारब्धयोरपि ज्ञानोदय समय एव विनाशः किं न स्यादितयाशङ्क्याह - प्रारब्धायेति । प्रारब्धाय प्रारब्ध फलाय सुकृताय दुष्कृताय च स्ववपुः समर्पितम् । तत्त्वविदोऽप्यादेहपातमात्र माभासमात्रेण संसारोऽङ्गीकर्तव्य इति फलितार्थः ।

Tatparya dipika

(Doubt) Before realization the accumulated merit and sin both are two-fold and have their fruits begun. The self is a non-doer of both of them equally. Therefore, like the initiated merit and sin,

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

why not accept the destruction of the uninitiated merit and sin also at the time of arise of knowledge itself?
(Reply) This doubt is dispelled with the words 'to the initiated (deeds)'. His own body is offered to the initiated merit and sin. Thus, the final meaning is that the objective world should be accepted even to the realized as mere appearance, till fall of his body.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

यदुक्तमनारब्धवदारब्धस्यापि नाशः किं न स्यादिति - तन्न । कस्मात् ? श्रुत्यनुभव युक्तिभ्यः आरब्धफलयोः कर्मणोरविनाशोऽवगम्यते तस्य तावदेव चिरं यावन्न विमोक्ष्येऽथ संपत्स्ये (ऐतरेय - 6-14-2) इति श्रुतिः । यथाऽनया श्रुत्या तत्त्वविदोऽप्यादेहपातं संसारोऽङ्गीकृतस्तथा विद्वदनुभवोऽप्यस्मिन्नर्थे स्फुटः। युक्तिश्चोच्यते - यथा तूणनिष्ठेषु बाणेषु धानुष्कस्य स्वीकारपरित्यागयोः स्वयतन्त्र्येऽपि मुक्ते बाणे स्वातन्त्र्यं न दृश्यते । स च बाणो वेगे क्षीणे स्वयं पतति । एवं कुलाल चक्रभ्रमणमुदाहर्तव्यम् । एवं ब्रह्मज्ञानस्याप्यनारब्धकर्मनाशकत्वे स्वातन्त्र्यमस्तु न त्वारब्धे कर्मणि आरब्धस्य प्रवृत्तफलत्वात् । तस्मान्नारब्ध फलयोः सुकृत दुष्कृतयोर्नाशः । अत एव भगवान् बादरायणः अनारब्धकार्ये एव तु पूर्वे तदवधेः (ब्रह्मसूत्रम् 4. 115) इत्यधिकरणेन इममर्थं प्रतिपादयामास ।

Tatparya dipika

Now whatever is said above that the initiated deeds also should have destruction like the uninitiated, the Reply is 'no'. Because, the initiated deeds are understood to have no destruction from the scriptures, experience and logic. The scripture says 'he has to wait till liberation'.
On the lines of this scriptural sentence, the objective world is accepted even to the self-realized till fall of his body. And the experience of the realized is in accordance with this. Now the logic is put forth: The archer is self-willed to accept or reject the arrow till it is in the quiver. He is not so, once the arrow is shot. It falls off by itself when the speed is lost. The movement of potter's wheel can be cited as example.
Similarly, let the realization of the Brahman be independent in destroying the uninitiated deeds, but not in destroying the initiated deeds. Because, the initiated deed has begun to yield the result.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Therefore, there is no destruction of the merit and sin whose result is not initiated. For this reason only, sage Badarayana also propounded the same meaning in the aphorism: 'but, only those former deeds are destroyed by knowledge whose effects have not yet begun. Because, the scripture says that the death is the limit for destruction ' (Brahmasutra IV-I-15).

तात्पर्यदीपिका

ननु केन तर्ह्यारब्धपुण्यपापयोः क्षय इति चेद् भोगेनेति ब्रूमः । तथा च विद्वान् भोगेन पुण्यपापे क्षपयित्वाऽखण्डसच्चिदानन्दैकरसमद्वितीयं ब्रह्म प्राप्नोति । तथा च श्रूयते तस्य तावदेव चिरं यावन्न विमोक्ष्येऽथ संपत्स्य इति ब्रह्मैव सन् ब्रह्माप्येतीति च । अत एव भगवान् बादरायणोऽप्येतदसूत्रयत्- भोगेन त्वितरे क्षपयित्वा संपद्यत (ब्रह्मसूत्रम् 4.1.19) इति ।

Tatparya dipika

If one asks as to how the initiated merit and sin get attenuated, the Reply is, through experience. The self- realized attenuates the merit and sin through experience and attains the non-dual Brahman that is of the form of absolute existence, consciousness (samvit) and bliss. The scripture states- he has to wait till he gets liberated then he is released and becoming the Brahman, he attains it. Therefore, sage Badarayana also aphorized-having exhausted the other two viz. merit and sin through experience, one attains oneness with the Brahman (Brahmasutra-IV-I-19).

तात्पर्यदीपिका

एतद्भगवत्पादैरेवोक्तम्-

प्रारब्धकर्मवेगेन जीवन्मुक्तो यथा भवेत् ।
कञ्चित्कालमनारब्धकर्मबन्धस्य संक्षये ।।
निरस्तातिशयानन्दं वैष्णवं परमं पदम् ।
पुनरावृत्तिरहितं कैवल्यं प्रतिपद्यते ।। इति ।

इतिशब्दो हेतौ । येनैतादृशेन विदुषा स्ववपुः प्रारब्धाय समर्पितं यतोऽतः स गुरुरित्येषा मम मनीषे त्यन्वयः । तस्माद् ब्रह्मात्मैक्ये न किञ्चिद् बाधकमिति भावः ।

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

The revered sage Shankaracharya himself enunciated the same thing:
By the strength of the initiated deeds, when one becomes Jivanmukta i.e., liberated while being alive, for some time he will experience the bondage of those deeds and at their destruction he will attain the higher state of Visnu, which is bliss par excellence and from which he will never return. In the verse (3), the word Iti is in the sense of reason. The way of construing the verse is that "it is my firm conviction that whosoever (realized-self of this kind) has offered his body to the initiated deeds, he is my preceptor". Therefore, there is no contradiction to the oneness of the self and the Brahman.

The non-identity of the body etc with the self.
देहादीनामनात्मत्वम्

तात्पर्यदीपिका

नन्वेवमपि स्थूलोऽहं कृशोऽहं काणोऽहं बधिरोऽहं बुभुक्षितोऽहं पिपासितोऽहं मन्ताऽहं निश्चेताऽहम्-इति देहादिरूपेणानुभूयमानप्रत्यगात्मनः कथं स्वप्रकाश चिदेकरसब्रह्मत्वमिति चेन्न, ममेदं चक्षुर्ममेदं श्रोत्रं ममायं प्राणो ममेदं मनो ममेयं बुद्धिरिति देहेन्द्रियादय इदङ्कारास्पदत्वेनानुभूयन्ते ।
आत्मा तु देहेन्द्रियप्राणमनोबुद्धिभ्योऽपि भिन्नतयादेवतिर्यङ्मनुष्यादिभिः सर्वैर्जन्तुभिरहमहमित्यन्तःस्फुटतरमहंप्रत्ययालम्बनत्वेन अनुभूयते । अतः इदङ्कारास्पद-देहेन्द्रियादीनां घटादिवदात्मत्वाभावेन सिद्धमहमर्थस्यैव प्रत्यगात्मतया स्वप्रकाश-चिदेकरसब्रह्मत्वम् । तदुक्तम् -

इदंबुद्धिश्च बाह्यार्थे त्वहंबुद्धिस्तथात्मनि ।
प्रसिद्धा सर्वजन्तूनां विवादोऽत्र न कश्चन ।।
इदमर्थे घटाद्यर्थे नात्मत्वं सर्वदेहिनाम् ।
अहमर्थे तथात्मत्वमपि सिद्धं स्वभावतः ।। इति ।।

Tatparya dipika

(Doubt) Even then the individual self is experienced as the physical body etc., on account of various experiences like' I am

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

robust, I am thin, I am blind, I am deaf, I am hungry, I am thirsty, I am the thinker and I am the decider etc.'
So, how can he be the Self-effulgent, Conscious Brahman?
(Reply) It is not so. This is my eye, this is my ear, this is my vital breath, this is my mind and this is my intellect- in this way body, sense-organs etc., are experienced as object of the thisness'.
But the self is experienced by all beings like the extra-terrestrial, animals and birds, human beings etc., as the seat of the awareness' I', vibrating inside always as I Consciousness (samvit) being different from the body, senses, vital-breath, mind and intellect. Therefore, the body, mind etc., are non-self like pot etc., as they are object of thisness.
On account of this, it is established that the meaning of I-consciousness (samvit) is the individual self and it is the self-effulgent, absolutely conscious Brahman.
It is said in these words: To all the creatures there is the common and unequivocal cognition of thisness in the external objects and I-Sense in the self. To all the selves, there is no I-Sense in the external objects like the pot etc., which are the object of this. Similarly, the self-ness in the meaning of the 'T' is quite natural.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

नन्वहं मनुष्य इत्यादौ मनुष्यत्वादिधर्मयुक्तदेहादिसमानाधिकरणाहं प्रत्ययस्य तद्विषयत्वमनुभवसिद्ध मिति चेन्नैष दोषः । चिद्भास्यत्वलक्षण-योगान्निश्चितेदमर्थे शरीरादौ जायमानोऽहंप्रत्ययः स्फटिके रक्तिम बुद्धिवद्भ्रान्तिरेव । अतस्मिंस्तद्बुद्धिर्विपर्यय इति तल्लक्षणयोगात् ।
अपि चान्नपरिणामरूपत्वाज्जडं स्थूल शरीरं तावदहंप्रत्ययस्य नालम्बनम् । तदनालम्बनत्वस्य मृत्पिण्डादौ जडे दृष्टत्वात् । अतोऽहंबुद्ध्यनालम्बन त्वात् स्थूलो देहो नात्मा । अत एवेन्द्रियप्राणमनोबुद्धयः स्थूलशरीरवदचिद्रूपत्वेनाहं बुद्ध्यनालम्बनत्वात् नात्मानः ।

Tatparya dipika

(Doubt) The experiences like I am human being etc., make object the I-Sense being co-existent of the body etc., that are endowed with the characteristics like humanness etc.
(Reply) It is no fault at all. The body etc. the meanings of the word this, get ascertained due to their characteristic of being endowed with the semblance of the consciousness (samvit).

The I-feeling arising in them is therefore, mere illusion like the cognition of redness in crystal, because of the possible definition of illusion as ' misapprehension of an object is illusion'.
Moreover, the gross body that is inert on account of it's being the modification of food etc. cannot be the object of I-Sense. The inert lump of clay etc. is observed as a non-object of I-Sense. Therefore, since it is not an object of the I-Sense, the gross body is not the self. For the same reason, the senses, vital-breath, mind, intellect etc., are also not the self as they are non-conscious like the gross body.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

नन्विन्द्रियादीनां चिद्भास्यत्वादस्तु अहंबुद्ध्यविषयत्वम् । बुद्धिस्तु चिद्रूपैव तस्मात् तदनालम्बनत्वमयुक्तमिति चेन्न तस्या उत्पत्तिविनाशधर्मवत्त्वाद् घटादिवदचिद्रूपत्वेन अहंप्रत्ययानालम्बत्वमनास्पदत्वं युक्तमेव ।

Tatparya dipika

(Doubt) Let the senses etc. be non-object to the I-Sense as they are illumined by the consciousness (samvit). But the intellect is consciousness (samvit) itself. Therefore, denying it as the object of the I-Sense is improper.
(Reply) It is not correct. The intellect has the characteristics of production and decay. On account of its inert nature like that of the pot etc., it is properly stated as a non-object of the I-Sense.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

नन्वहङ्कारस्याहंबुद्ध्यालम्बनत्वेन आत्मत्वमस्त्विति चेन्न तस्यापि सत्त्वपरिणामरूपान्तःकरणकार्यं तया चिद्भास्यत्वेन जडत्वाद् घटादिवदहंप्रत्ययाना-लम्बनतया नात्मत्वम् । अपि चाहङ्कारस्तावदात्मा न भवति, अहं सुखी अहं दुःखीति सर्वप्रत्ययरूपेण विवर्तमानतया विकारित्वात् शरीरवत् । किञ्च दध्याकारपरिणामिनः क्षीरादेरनित्यत्वं लोकप्रसिद्धम् । तद्वत् सर्वप्रत्ययात्मना परिणममानस्याहङ्कारस्य तथाविधमचेत नत्वं केन निवारयितुं पार्यते। तस्माद् देहेन्द्रियादीनां चिद्भास्यत्वेन घटादिवत् परागर्थत्वात् प्रत्यग्भूतः साक्षी चिन्मात्ररूप एवात्माहंप्रत्ययस्य विषयो नाचिद्रूपं जडं देहेन्द्रियादिकम् ।

 In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

ननु यदि चिन्मात्ररूप आत्माऽहंबुद्धिविषयस्तर्हि तस्य स्वप्रकाशत्वभङ्ग इति चेन्नैष दोषः । सर्वान्तरस्य प्रत्यगात्मनोऽहंप्रत्ययविषयत्वे सत्यप्यसौ स्वप्रकाशमान एव भवति ।

Tatparya dipika

(Doubt) Then accept the ego-principle as the self. Because, it is the object of the I-Sense.
(Reply) It cannot be. The ego-principle is an evolute of the inner-sense organ as the sattwic modification. It is also inert as it is illumined by the consciousness (samvit). It is non-object of the self like pot etc., Therefore, it cannot be the self. Further, the ego-principle cannot be the self as, like the physical body, it is object to change always due to its various modifications in the form of I am comfortable, I am miserable' etc., which is a matter of experience to everyone.
Due to this modification only, it is not the self. Moreover, it is common in the world that the milk etc., changing into curd etc., is transient. Similarly, the ego-principle also modifies into innumerable feelings.
Therefore, who can prevent it from becoming an inert thing like that? For these reasons, it is now established that the body, senses etc., are for the enjoyment of some other like the pot etc., as they are illumined by the Consciousness (samvit).
So, the inner-self that is observer and absolute consciousness (samvit) is the object of the I-Sense, not the non-intelligent and inert body, senses etc.
(Doubt) If the absolutely conscious self is the object of the I-Sense, then the self-illumination of the self gets rejected. (Reply) It is not any fallacy. The immanent individual self is definitely self-illuminating even if it becomes an object to the I-Sense.

Utility of the thought wave in self-realization
आत्मसाक्षात्कारे वृत्तिविनियोगः

तात्पर्यदीपिका

ननु बुद्धिवृत्तिविषयत्वं स्वप्रकाशत्वं च परस्परविरुद्धमिति चेन्नायं दोषः । प्रत्यगात्मनः सत्यपि बुद्धिरूपविषयत्वे घटकुड्यादिवत् स्फुरणं तदधिकम्। किन्तु स्वच्छां

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

बुद्धिवृत्तिमनुप्राप्य तस्या वृत्तेर्भासक साक्षिचिद्रूपेणायं व्यवस्थितः सन् स्वयमेव प्रकाशते ।

नन्वहमर्थश्चिदात्मा स्वयं प्रकाशमानश्चेदहंबुद्धिस्तर्हि किमर्थेति चेत्, आत्मस्वरूपावरण भूताज्ञाननिवृत्त्यर्थेति ब्रूमः । तथा चोक्तम्

ब्रह्मण्यज्ञाननाशाय वृत्तिव्याप्तिरपेक्षिता ।
स्वयंस्फुरणरूपत्वान्नाभास उपयुज्यते ।। इति ।

अज्ञाननिवृत्तिरपि स्वप्रकाशचिन्मात्ररूपेणावशिष्यते । तदुक्तम्- **अधिष्ठानावशेषो हि नाशः कल्पितवस्तुनः** इति ।। 3 ।।

Tatparya dipika

(Doubt) But, self-illumination and becoming object to the I-Sense are mutually contradictory.
(Reply) This is not any fault. In spite of this similarity, there is a difference between the inert objects like a pot, wall etc., and the self. It is self-illumination. Being the illuminator of the pure thought-wave, the self follows it and illumines independently only.
(Doubt) If this conscious self that is the object of the I- Sense, is self-effulgent, then for what purpose is this I-Sense? (Reply) We say that it is to dispel the ignorance, which covers the true nature of the self. Hence it is said: The thought- wave of the form of the Brahman is desirable to dispel the ignorance about the Brahman. The semblance is useless as the self then is self-effulgent.
Then the destruction of the ignorance also remains as the self-effulgent absolute consciousness (samvit) only.
Because, the preceptors say that the destruction of the imposed thing is no other than the substratum itself (of that imposition). (3)

*****

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

श्रीशङ्करभगवत्पादविरचितम्

मनीषापञ्चकम्

श्लोकः -४

या तिर्यङ्नरदेवताभिरहमित्यन्तः स्फुटा गृह्यते
यद्भासा हृदयाक्षदेहविषया भान्ति स्वतोऽचेतनाः ।
तां भास्यैः पिहितार्कमण्डलनिभां स्फूर्तिं सदा भावयन्
योगी निर्वृतमानसो हि गुरुरित्येषा मनीषा मम ।। 4 ।।

This is my firm conviction that the Yogi is my preceptor who is self-content by contemplating intently upon that Consciousness (samvit), which is experienced within evidently by the animals, human beings and the divine beings and due to which even the inert heart, senses and the body function and which is like the sun-disk veiled by the objects like clouds illumined by it.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

तस्मात् स्वप्रकाशचिदेकरसः कूटस्थनित्यः प्रत्यगात्मा अहमर्थः । स च स्वप्रकाशचिदेकरसं ब्रह्मैवेत्यनवद्यमभिप्रेत्याह **या तिर्यगिति** । **तिर्यञ्चः** कीटपतङ्गादयः एतैस्तिर्यगादिजन्तुभि**रहमिति** अहंप्रत्ययालम्बनत्वे**नान्तः**-सर्वान्तरतया **स्फुटा** प्रकाशान्तरनिरपेक्षतया स्वयंप्रकाशमाना **या स्फूर्ति**श्चिदेकरसः परमात्मा **गृह्यते**ऽनुभूयते न देहेन्द्रियादयः । कुत इति चेत्- तेषां स्वतो जडत्वेन चिद्भास्यत्वादित्याह **यदिति** । स्वतोऽचेतनाः हृदयाक्षदेहविषयाः **यद्भासा** यस्य स्वप्रकाशचिदेकरसस्यात्मनो **भासा** प्रकाशेन **भान्ति** तस्य भासा सर्वमिदं विभाति इति श्रुतेः । तदुक्तम् -

अजडात्मवदाभान्ति यत्सान्निध्याज्जडा अपि ।
देहेन्द्रियमनः प्राणाः सोऽहमित्यवधारय ।।

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Tatparya dipika

Therefore, the self-effulgent, absolutely conscious and immanent Individual self is the meaning of the I-Sense. That self is no other than the self-effulgent, absolutely conscious and immanent Brahman. With this idea it is said with the words' which by the animals etc., here the word tiryak stands for the insects, moths etc.

By these beings the supreme self is experienced as the object of the I-Sense evidently within. Here, the word within means inside all. The word evidently means without the need of any other illumination. That self- effulgent consciousness (samvit) is the absolute supreme-self only. The object of this experience is not body, senses etc.

Because, the body, senses are inert by themselves and require to be illuminated by the consciousness (samvit). So, the word 'that is used in the verse. Inherently inert body, senses, heart etc., function due to the effulgence of this self-effulgent, absolute consciousness (samvit) only.

The scriptures also state this with the words' due the effulgence of the self only all this illumines.'

Hence it is said; you realize that you are that consciousness (samvit) due to whose proximity even the inanimate like body, senses, mind and vital-breath appear to be animate.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

ननु यदि अयमात्मा स्फुटतरमहंप्रत्ययगम्यः स्यात् तर्ह्ययत्नेन सर्वे जन्तवः किमिति न मुक्ताः स्युः इत्याशङ्क्याह- प्रत्ययालम्बनत्वेनात्मानं जानन्तोऽप्यसङ्ग-चिदानन्दस्वरूपत्वेन चिद्भास्याज्ञानपटलावृता विविच्य न जानन्ति यथा आदित्यावभास्याभ्रावृताक्षो जन्तुरर्कं विघनमिवाद्धा विविच्य न जानाति। किन्तु घनाच्छन्नं निष्प्रभमेव जानाति । तद्वदहंप्रत्ययास्पदत्वेन जानन्तोऽप्यसङ्गमात्मानं न जानन्ति । तथा चोक्तम्

तमहंप्रत्ययव्याजात् सर्वे जानन्ति जन्तवः ।
तथा शिवरूपेण न विजानन्ति मोहिताः ।। इति।

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Tatparya dipika

(Doubt) If this self is evidently the object of the I-Sense, then why all the creatures are not released?
(Reply) Though knowing the self as the object of the consciousness (samvit), people do not realize it distinctly due to the cover of the ignorance that is illumined by the consciousness (samvit) only, as anybody whose sight is covered by the cloud that is illumined by the sun, does not realize distinctly the sun as out of clouds. Instead, he understands the sun to be covered by the clouds and lustreless.
In the same manner, though knowing the self as object of the consciousness (samvit), people do not realize it as unattached. The same is said: all the creatures know the self as the object of the I-Sense, but being illuded they never realize the self as auspicious.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

एतदभिप्रायेणाह - **भासैः पिहितार्कमण्डलनिभामिति** । निभां सदृशामित्यर्थः । तस्माद् देहेन्द्रियादिविलक्षणतया स्फुटतराऽहमनुभवगम्यं तत्साक्षिणी या स्फूर्तिश्चिदेकरसः परमात्मा तां स्वप्रकाशचिदेकरसमात्मानं सदाऽनन्यव्यापारतया भावयन् स एवाहमिति तदेकाकारवृत्तिसंतानं कुर्वन्नित्यर्थः । तदुक्तम्-

सावधानतया नित्यं स्वात्मानं चैव भावयेत् ।
दृश्यं ह्यदृश्यतां नीत्वा ब्रह्माकारेण चिन्तयेत् ।। इति ।

Tatparya dipika

With this idea it is said with the words' which is like the sun-disk covered by the clouds illumined by the sun itself '. In this sentence the word nibham means similar. Thus, one should always ponder over the self-effulgent, absolute Self i.e., the absolute consciousness (samvit) that is the observer of the most vivid I-Sense, distinctly from the body, senses etc. Here, 'always' means without any other activities.
'Pondering' over means allowing the flow of thought-waves homogenous to the Consciousness (samvit) in the form of I am verily that Consciousness (samvit). Hence it is said: one should

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

contemplate on the self with utmost attention and nullifying the objective world one should reflect on it as the Brahman.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

अयमेव संप्रज्ञातसमाधिरित्युच्यते । तं भगवान् पतञ्जलिः सूत्रयामास-तत्र प्रत्ययैकतानतैकविषयप्रवाहः । स च द्विविधः विच्छिद्य विच्छिद्य जायमानः सन्ततश्चेति । तावुभौ कमेण ध्यानसमाधी भवतः ।
तदुभयं दर्शितम्–

चित्तैकाग्रयादतो ज्ञानमुक्तं समुपजायते ।
तत्साधनमतो ध्यानं यथावदुपदिश्यते ।।
विलाप्य विकृतिं कृत्स्नां संभवव्यत्ययक्रमात् ।
परिशिष्टञ्च सन्मात्रं चिदानन्दं विचिन्तयेत् ।।इति।
ब्रह्माकारमनोवृत्तिप्रवाहोऽहङ्कृतिं विना ।
संप्रज्ञातसमाधिः स्याद् ध्यानाभ्यासप्रकर्षतः ।। इति।

Tatparya dipika

The same is called as Samprajnata Samadhi. Revered sage Patanjali has aphorized as 'among them, the flow of homogenous thought-waves is '*Pratyaya ekatanata 'Dhyana'* (Yogasutra II-2). That also is two-fold viz., 1) intermittently arising and 2) incessantly continuing.
Those two are *dhyana* and *samadhi* respectively. Both these varieties are demonstrated in this manner: the realization is through one- pointedness of mind. Now, its means, dhyana, is enunciated.
Denying the entire material world in the process of projection and withdrawal, one should reflect on the remnant i.e., the absolutely existent, conscious and blissful Brahman. On the strength of this dhyana, the arise of thought-wave as the Brahman is *Samprajnata Samadhi* without the ego-principle present in it.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

तात्पर्यदीपिका

तत्साधनमुपदर्शयन्नाह योगीति । योगश्चित्तवृत्तिनिरोधः तद्वान् योगी । योगशब्दो मौनादेरप्युपलक्षणम् । तथा च स्मर्यते-

मौनं योगासनं योगैस्तितिक्षैकान्तशीलता ।
निःस्पृहत्वं समत्वञ्च सप्तैतान्येकदण्डिनः ।। इति ।

अथ वा योगो जीवब्रह्मैक्यज्ञानम् । तद्वान् योगी ।तथा च स्मर्यते-

वृत्तिहीनं मनः कृत्वा क्षेत्रज्ञं परमात्मनि ।
एकीकृत्य विमुच्येत योगोऽयं मुख्य उच्यते ।।इति ।

Tatparya dipika

The sage demonstrates the means of that samadhi with the word' yogi'. Yoga means the cessation of thought-waves (Yogasutra I-2). Yogin is one who has attained that yoga. The word yoga indicates silence etc.
This is stated in the Smrti as:
silence, practice of yoga postures, tolerance, resorting to solitude, desire lessness and equipoised mind. These seven are ordained for an *ekadandin* (sannyasin).
Otherwise, yoga means realization of the self and the Brahman. One who attained this is a Yogin. The smriti states: making the mind thoughtless and uniting the self with the Brahman one should liberate oneself. This is called the principal yoga.

Role of intense imagination in self-realization
आत्मसाक्षाम्कारे भावनाविनियोगः

तात्पर्यदीपिका

नन्वनेन ज्ञानस्य भावनासाधनत्वमुक्तं भवतीति चेद् बाढम् । तमेव धीरो विज्ञाय प्रज्ञां कुर्वात ब्राह्मणः इत्यनया श्रुत्या ज्ञानानन्तरं भावनायाः प्रतिपादितत्वात्। ततः किमित्यत आह निर्वृतमानसः इति । निर्वृतिः स्वरूपसुखं तद्वन्मानसं यस्य स तथोक्तः। तथा च विदुषो निरुद्धाशेषवाग्व्यापारमनोवृत्तितया विदिततत्त्वतया वा निरन्तरं निर्विघ्नेन भावनानुवृत्तौ परिपूर्णस्वप्रकाशचिदेकरसब्रह्मानन्द आविर्भवतीति भावः ।

Tatparya dipika

(Doubt) In this way, is not the knowledge recommended as the means of contemplation?
(Reply) Well, the contemplation is recommended after knowledge by the scripture itself with the words' having thoroughly known the self, the wise aspirant should then reflect on it. ´ What then? It is said' to a self-content person'. Here, self-content person means one whose mind is filled with the bliss of own form.
Nivruti here means the bliss of own nature. The idea is that the absolute bliss as Brahman, which is absolutely self-effulgent and conscious, will arise to the realized, on account of incessant continuation of the contemplation, either when all the functions of the speech and mind cease or when the reality is realized.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

तथा चोक्तम्-

शान्तसंदेहदौरात्म्यं गतकौतुकविभ्रमम् ।
परिपूर्णतरं चेतः पूर्णेन्दुरिव राजते ।।
परिप्राप्तं विवेकस्य त्यक्तसंसारसंस्थितेः ।
चेतसस्त्यजतो रूपमानन्दो हि विवर्धते ।। इति ।

हि शब्दो हेतौ । हि यस्माद् यो निरुद्धमनाः स्फूर्तिं भावयन्नास्ते सुखितमानसः गुरुरिति मम मनीषेत्यन्वयः । इत्थं जीवब्रह्मैक्यं सुष्ठु प्रतिपादितमिति भावः ।। 4 ।

Tatparya dipika

The same is said as: The mind that is free from qualms, from ill feelings and from glee and gloom and perfect, shines like the full moon. To the man who has obtained discretion, who has renounced the world and who is cancelling the form of the mind, the bliss increases. The word hi is in the sense of reason. The way of construing the sentence is in this way: since the self-controlled remains contemplating on the self, he is self-content and he is my preceptor. In this way the oneness of the self and the Brahman is well established. (4)

*****

 In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

श्रीशङ्करभगवत्पादविरचितम्

मनीषापञ्चकम्

श्लोकः -५

यत्सौख्याम्बुधिलेशलेशत इमे शक्रदयो निर्वृताः
यच्चित्ते नितरां प्रशान्तकलने लब्ध्वा मुनिर्निर्वृतः ।
यस्मिन्नित्यसुखाम्बुधौ गलितधीर्ब्रह्मैव न ब्रह्मविद्
यः कश्चित् स सुरेन्द्रवन्दितपदो नूनं मनीषा मम ।। 5 ।।

This is my firm conviction that he is highly revered even by the foremost of gods, who is the Brahman only and not the knower of the Brahman when his personal awareness has melted away in the ocean of eternal bliss, who has become blissful after silencing the mind by attaining the Brahman, from the iota of whose ocean of bliss, the Indra and other gods became blissful. (5)

तात्पर्यदीपिका

प्रत्यगात्मनः परमप्रेमास्पदत्वेन परमानन्दब्रह्मता सुघटत इत्याह यस्य स्वप्रकाशचिदेकरसस्यात्मनः सुखमेव **सौख्यं** स्वार्थे ष्यञ् प्रत्ययः । **तदेवाम्बुधि-रिवाम्बुधिः** सर्वत्रैकरसत्वात् । तस्य **लेशलेशत इमे शक्रादयो निर्वृताः** सुखिनो भवन्ति - एतस्यैवानन्दस्यान्यानि भूतानि मात्रामुपजीवन्ति इति श्रुतेः । **यस्मिन् नित्यसुखाम्बुधौ** नित्यनिरतिशयानन्देकरसे **ब्रह्मणि,** गलितधीः गलिता निमग्ना तद्भावमापन्ना धीः चेतो यस्य स तथोक्तः । स्वप्रकाशचिद्घनसदानन्दैकरसवस्तु-मात्रत्वेन अवस्थितस्वान्त इत्यर्थः । अयमेव असंप्रज्ञातसमाधिरिति संगीयते । तथा च तं समाधिमसूत्रयत् पतञ्जलिः तदेवार्थमात्रनिर्भासं स्वरूपशून्यमिव समाधिरिति । तथा चोक्तम्-

मनसो वृत्तिशून्यस्य ब्रह्माकारतया स्थितिः ।
याऽसंप्रज्ञातनामासौ समाधिरभिधीयते ।। इति ।।

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Tatparya dipika

The individual self is the dearest to everyone and therefore, it is the Brahman of the form of absolute bliss. This idea is expressed with the words whose etc. The words of this verse are to be explained in this way-' whose' means of the self-effulgent, absolute consciousness (samvit)' i.e., the Atman; Saukhya means sukha only. It is the syan suffix in the same sense. That bliss is like ocean because of its absolute nature. By an iota of this the gods like Indra etc., become blissful. The scripture says all the other beings' resort to a portion of this absolute bliss only.' 'In which' means' in the eternal ocean of bliss 'that is' the absolute eternal, blissful Brahman'.

The word' melted intellect' means' one whose intellect has merged into the Brahman or became one with the Brahman'. That means' one whose mind has remained as self-effulgent, conscious, eternally blissful Reality'. This state is called as Asamprajnata Samadhi.

Thus, sage Patanjali has aphorized as: samadhi is contemplation only in which only the self, shines forth and which appears to have no form at all. The same is said as: the state of thought -less mind remaining as the Brahman is called Asamprajnata Samadhi.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

इत्थं **यः कश्चित्** परिपूर्णपरमानन्दपयोनिधौ प्रलीनमनस्कः स तु परिपूर्णपरमानन्द स्वरूपत्वात् तत्स्वरूपं **ब्रह्मैव न ब्रह्मविद्** भेदाभावात् । तथा च श्रूयते - स यो ह वै तत् परमं ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मैव भवति । (मुण्डक 3-2-1) स्मर्यते च-

दर्शनादर्शने हित्वा स्वयं केवलरूपतः ।
यस्तिष्ठति स तु ब्रह्मन् ब्रह्म न ब्रह्मवित् स्वयम् ।। इति ।।

Tatparya dipika

In this manner, one who has his mind completely merged into the ocean of absolute supreme bliss is of the form of absolute supreme bliss only.

He is indeed the Brahman of that form and not the knower of the Brahman, since there is no difference at all. The scripture states

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

the same as: one who realizes the absolute Brahman becomes the Brahman only.
The Smrti also states this as:

O Brahman! One, who remains in his real form after abandoning the knowledge and ignorance, is the Brahman only and not the knower of the Brahman.

तात्पर्यदीपिका

अत एव **सुरेन्द्रवन्दितपदः** । सुरेन्द्रैरिन्द्रादिभिर्भूतिकामैर्मनुष्यैश्च वन्दितौ पादौ यस्य स तथोक्तः । तथा च श्रूयते तस्मादात्मज्ञं ह्यर्चयेद् भूतिकाम इति । एतदेवाभिप्रेत्योक्तम्-

विचारेण परिप्राप्तविवेकस्योदितात्मनः ।
अनुकम्प्या भवन्त्येते ब्रह्मविष्विन्द्रशङ्कराः ।। इति ।।

अथवा सुरेन्द्रवन्दितपदः सुरेन्द्रैः ब्रह्मादिभिः वन्दितम् अहमित्यपरोक्षेणानुभूतं पदं स्थानं ब्रह्मस्वरूपं यस्य स तथोक्तः । अत एवेन्द्रवाक्यं श्रूयते च प्राणोऽस्मि प्रज्ञात्मा तं मामायुरमृतमित्युपासीदेति । श्रुत्यन्तरे नारदञ्च प्रति ब्रह्मवाक्यं श्रूयते शान्तममलमद्वयानन्दविज्ञानघन एवास्मि तदेव मम धामेति ।
एतदेवाभिप्रेत्योक्तम्-

निमेषार्थं न तिष्ठन्ति वृत्तिं ब्रह्ममयीं विना ।
यया तिष्ठन्ति ब्रह्माद्याः सनकाद्याः शुकादयः । । इति ।

इत्येतादृशः **स गुरुरिति मम मनीषेत्यन्वयः**। उक्तार्थे आदर्तव्यतां दर्शयितुमाह **नूनमिति** । इयता प्रबन्धेन यत्प्रतिपादितं तत्सर्वं निश्चितमेवेत्यर्थः || 5 ||

इति श्रीसदाशिवब्रह्मेन्द्रयोगिविरचितं
मनीषापञ्चकविवरणं
समाप्तम् ।

Tatparya dipika

For this reason only, he is venerated even by the foremost of gods. It means that his feet are worshipped by the foremost of gods and human beings who desire prosperity. The scripture states this as:

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Therefore, a person desiring prosperity should venerate the Knower of the Atman.

Referring to this it is said:

Gods like Brahman, Vishnu, Indra and Shankara become pitiable before this person who has realized the Self on the rise of discrimination obtained through constant reflection.

Or, the compound *'surendra-vandita-pada'* can be explained in this manner also: *surendra* means the gods like *Brahaman* etc., *vandita* means realized directly as 'T'; *padam* means State i.e., the state of the Attribute less Brahman; Therefore, the compound *'surendra-vandita-pada'* means' one who has attained the state of the Attribute less Brahman that is realized directly by the gods like the creator Brahman etc.'

Hence, the scripture states the words of God Indra as-" I am the vital breath of the form of intellect. Reflect on me as the longevity and eternity."

In another scripture Brahman says these words to sage Narada: "I am verily the unperturbed, pure, non-dual absolute Intelligence. That is my abode."

Referring to this it is said: like the Brahman and like the sages Sanaka and others and Suka and others, the Self- realized do not remain without the Brahmanized thought- wave even for a second.

The connection with the verse is that it is my firm conviction that this kind of a self is my preceptor. The word *nunam* in the verse is to indicate that the thought enunciated here should be sincerely practiced.

It means that whatever has been enunciated so far through this much of text is totally ascertained.

Here ends Tatparyadipika, a commentary by Sri Sadashivendra yogin, on the Manisapanchákam of Adi Shankara

*****

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Sanskrit Academy

(Estd.1954)

An institution for advanced Sanskrit learning & research in Hyderabad with a rich history of about 70 years.

Sanskrit learning, research, Publications, Programs - all at one place.

* तेजस्वि नावधीतमस्तु *

(May our study be vigorous)

Sanskrit Academy

Adarsha Shodha Sanskrit Sanstha

(Recognised by Central Sanskrit University, New Delhi)

Osmania University, Hyderabad – 500 007

2025

ISBN - 978-93-49398-79-5